

## Spanish Marranism Re-examined\*

Herman P. SALOMON\*\*  
The University at Albany

“By heaven, I’ll know thy thoughts!”  
“You cannot, if my heart were in your hand,  
nor shall not, whilst ‘tis in my custody.”

Shakespeare, *Othello*

Recent publications by two French historians, Israel S. Révah and Charles Amiel, have given the impetus for the writing of this essay.<sup>1</sup> They concern the intensive inquisitorial persecution 1588-1600 of a native Spanish (i.e. non-Portuguese) Judaizing nucleus located in the towns of Quintanar de la Orden (under the jurisdiction of the Cuenca tribunal) and Alcázar de San Juan (under the jurisdiction of the Toledo tribunal) in New Castile. Because of date, location, numbers and autochthonous ethnicity of its victims, the episode constitutes somewhat of an anomaly in the annals of continental Spain’s inquisitorial tribunals.

\* A la memoria de D. Manuel Alvar López (1923-2001). Amigo, colega, maestro.

\*\* herman\_prins\_salomon@hotmail.com

<sup>1</sup> I. S. RÉVAH, *Antonio Enríquez Gómez. Un écrivain marrane (v. 1600-1663)*, éd C. L. Wilke (Paris 2003) [hereafter RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*]; C. AMIEL, “Les cent voix de Quintanar. Le modèle castillan du marranisme (I),” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 218, 2 (2001), 195-280 (hereafter AMIEL, “Marranisme” I). The second part: “Les cent voix de Quintanar. Le modèle castillan du marranisme (II)” appeared in *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 218, 4 (2001), 487-577 [hereafter AMIEL, “Marranisme” II]. On pp. 207-208 of his study, Amiel explains the title of his English summary, which appears at the outset: “The Hundred ‘Voiceless’ of Quintanar.” The French words *cent voix* = “hundred voices,” referring to the victims’ originally hundred (?) *procesos*, pun on *sans voix* = “voiceless,” referring to the victims’ consignment to oblivion, were it not for 64 *procesos* alphabetically listed by Amiel. (Actually, if we discount the posthumous ones, Amiel lists 43 in which the defendant’s voice may be heard: 36 kept in the *Archivo Diocesano de Cuenca* and seven in Madrid’s *Archivo Histórico Nacional*.) The two-part study, mostly written in the 1970’s, so Amiel informs the reader (AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 208-209), is the lightened version of a book on which he is still working and the expanded version of his study “El criptojudaismo castellano en la Mancha a finales del siglo XVI,” presented as a paper at a Symposium held in New York (November 2-6, 1992) published in *Judíos, Sefarditas, Conversos, La expulsión de 1492 y sus consecuencias*, A. Alcalá, ed. (Valladolid 1995), 503-512

Based on their study of the trial records, both historians conclude that these prove the reality of crypto-Judaism in Quintanar and Alcázar and that therefore the religious quiddity of an inquisitorial document is a reliable historical source.<sup>2</sup>

Near the outset of his study, Amiel makes the following fundamentally important caveat:

We must distinguish between ‘voluntary denunciators’ and ‘coerced denunciators’, i.e. between those [...] who were free to denounce [person(s)] to the Inquisition [for Judaizing], or to refrain from doing so and those who were summoned or already incarcerated or knew that they were about to be arrested. Those of the latter category had no hope of surviving except to make all the denunciations that were expected of them. Among the fifty or so initial declarations are those which set the inquisitorial machinery in motion, as well as the more or less coerced ones made by summoned persons who had been cited in earlier testimonies. All these are of a different order from the ineluctable survival denunciations, which the incarcerated Mora family members had to make reciprocally to save their skins. These take over from the initial outside ones and will spin the gigantic spider web into which all will be caught – by their own. The examination of the *procesos* leaves no doubt on this score: the proportion and weight of the reciprocal family denunciations in comparison with those from outside are overwhelming.<sup>3</sup>

None the less, Amiel, in spite of his caveat, seems to believe that all Judaic observances confessed and reciprocally denounced by the inquisitorial prisoners of Quintanar are factual. They constitute for him, as his title indicates, “*le*

---

and, in French, under the title “Le modèle castillan du marranisme,” in *Annuaire EHESS* (1994-1995), 317-320; (1995-1996), 293-295; (1996-1997), 294-295. This title and the idea behind it derive from Gérard Nahon’s lecture “Le modèle français du marranisme,” *Annuaire EPHE V*, 90 (1981-1982), 264-265. The text of all Révah’s unpublished lectures and lecture notes on Enríquez Gómez and his ancestors – referred to by Amiel as “the Master’s notes” to which he had access and upon which he “improved” – are incorporated in the above-mentioned work edited by Carsten L. Wilke. I thank him for providing me with a pre-publication printout [hereafter P.P.P.] containing the original Spanish of many documents given only in French translation in the 2003 publication. It also contains a most useful 40-page anthology – eliminated from the 2003 publication – of comparative versions – gleaned by Révah from the *procesos* – of “crypto-Judaic liturgy in 16<sup>th</sup>-century Quintanar.”

<sup>2</sup> “[...] It becomes clear that the archives of the Inquisition are reliable, as long as the critical approach is one that befits religious history” (See AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 195). Cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 142: “[...] Cette histoire unit le marranisme pré-inquisitorial à celui qui se maintient malgré la persécution du Saint-Office”.

<sup>3</sup> AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 235-236. This and all subsequent translations from the French are mine.

*modèle castillan du marranisme.*” What is “Marranism”<sup>4</sup>? In the absence of a dictionary definition I empirically distill from Amiel’s study the following one, which corresponds quite closely to the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitors’ definition of the Judaic heresy misnamed by them *Judaismo*:

The genetically or didactically transmitted secret adherence to beliefs; observance of customs; practice of precepts; knowledge and recitation of prayers characteristic of Jews on the part of baptized Catholics who are descended – at whatever remove – from Jews.

Now the term “Marranism” (alternately “crypto-Judaism”) as flaunted by some modern professional historians (e.g. Amiel) has taken on the content of the Inquisitors’ definition of “Judaism.” In addition, by their uncritical use of this term, these historians have taken over the Inquisitors’ implicit and unquestioned belief in its reality, however absurd many of its aspects may appear to the intelligent reader. Indeed, this belief in the reality of “Marranism” has itself taken on some of the contours of a religious faith and the believers (who are professional historians) might almost pass for apologists. The “Marranist” historian’s self-imposed task is to illustrate the reality of Marranism by way of documents produced by the Inquisition. In the inquisitorial context, Marranism’s reality justifies its extermination. To be sure, the 20<sup>th</sup>- and 21<sup>st</sup>-century “Marranist” historian deplores the context (within which he operates), that of a repressive inquisitorial society. But he does not see it as his role to moralize or to impose his preferences on his historical subject.

In this study, I intend to submit the “Marranism” of late 16<sup>th</sup>-century Quintanar and Alcázar, as presented by Amiel and – as we shall see further on – in a less extreme form and with reservations by Révah, to a close reading. During my visits to the *Archivo Diocesano de Cuenca* in May and November 2003, May 2004, May 2005, February-May-June-August-November 2006, as well as to Madrid’s *Archivo Histórico Nacional* in June 2006, I took a fresh look at all the surviving *procesos* pertaining to this episode.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> This English derivative of Marrano and its Romance cognates (“marranisme”; “marranismo”) are apparently of recent coinage as is the French verb *marraniser* (“to marranize”). For the origin of “Marrano,” see J. COROMINAS and J. A. PASCUAL, *Diccionario Crítico Etimológico Castellano e Hispánico* (Madrid 1980).

<sup>5</sup> Of those tried and sentenced in person 25 are missing as are nine of those posthumously tried and symbolically executed. Sixteen *procesos* of deceased persons are extant. Whereas posthumous *procesos* obviously do not allow us to hear the voices of the defendants, they do occasionally present introductory denunciations and other extracts from missing *procesos*.

## 1. INQUISITORIAL PERSECUTION OF THE DE MORA CLAN OF QUINTANAR

In 1598 there appeared in Madrid a compendium in Latin of some 1000 pages entitled *De origine et progressu Office Sanctae Inquisitionis* by Luís de Páramo (1545-?), Archdeacon of Borox (a small town near Toledo), Canon of León, sometime Inquisitor of Sicily. He writes on p. 304 that in 1588, in a Spanish town called Quintanar in the region called “Mancha de Aragón”<sup>6</sup> the Inquisition discovered about 30 men and women observing Old Testament rites and ceremonies:

They were the great-grand-children of those Jews who in the times of the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella had joined the Catholic Church under false pretences. The lot of them, when their perfidy was discovered was thrown into prison. A few obstinate ones perished at the stake. The others, as is customary, were marked by the dress of infamy. As to those – a sizeable number – who had died in the Judaic perfidy, their mortal remains were dug up and reduced to ashes so that it became clear for all to see that, thanks to the Holy Inquisition, this fertile and valiant province was rid of the Judaic perversion once and for all.<sup>7</sup>

This passage is the starting point of Amiel’s 2001 study, inspired by (and to a large extent based on) the then still unpublished lectures and research notes of his late mentor, Israel S. Révah. Both authors claim that Paramo’s statistics stand corrected by their research in the Spanish inquisitorial archives. Instead of “about 30 men and women” the persecution involved “more than 80 members of the same [de Mora] family” (Révah),<sup>8</sup> “precisely 100” (Amiel)<sup>9</sup> (both historians counting those who were tried posthumously). Moreover, it extended geographically to nearby towns in La Mancha, Alcázar, Argamasilla and Huete.

<sup>6</sup> As Amiel points out (“Marranisme” I, 211), “Aragón” in this case is not the kingdom by that name but a mountainous region east of Chinchilla called Montearagón.

<sup>7</sup> “[...] *eorum Judaeorum pronepotes atque proneptes qui tempore Ferdinandi et Elizabethae Catholicorum regum se ficte et simulate ad Catholicam Ecclesiam aggregarunt. Omnes, ergo, ubi detecta fuit eorum perfidia, in carcerem sunt coniecti, pauci pertinaces tandem combusti, ceteri (ut moris est) infamiae veste notati, multorum etiam qui e vita in Judaica perfidia decesserant effossa ossa et concremata, ut Sanctae Inquisitionis beneficio haec ferax et bellicosa provincia a Judaica pravitate omnino jam repurgata videatur.*” Cited in French translation in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 138 and, along with the original Latin, in AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 201.

<sup>8</sup> RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 138.

<sup>9</sup> AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 208.

Páramo does not mention the fact that all the victims were closely interrelated: part of a “clan” as it were, and that whereas Quintanar de la Orden came under the inquisitorial tribunal of Cuenca, Alcázar, Argamasilla and Huete were subject to the inquisitorial tribunal of Toledo.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, since Páramo limited his observation to actual residents of Quintanar, the approximate figure of 30 corresponds to the number of those from that town arrested around the year he mentioned.

Révah picked up a more serious error of Páramo’s.<sup>11</sup> Páramo writes, in effect, that the victims from Quintanar were “the great-grand-children of those Jews who in the times of the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella had joined the Catholic Church under false pretenses.” He is referring, of course, to those Jews affected by the expulsion order of March 31, 1492 who thanks to their conversion were able to remain in, or return to Spain. Révah points out that the Jewish ancestors of the late 16<sup>th</sup>-century Quintanar victims of the Inquisition were not – as Páramo claims – those affected by the 1492 order of expulsion, but New Christians (or, indeed, Old Christians spuriously given the status of New Christians) from “way back.”

Let us look at the earliest inquisitorial activity directed against New Christians of Quintanar de la Orden (or “de la Encina”) by the Holy Office of Cuenca.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 206-207.

<sup>11</sup> RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 138.

<sup>12</sup> The Cuenca tribunal, created in 1489, functioned 1489-1500 and 1509-1820. Its archives, practically intact, are part of the *Archivo Diocesano de Cuenca* (hereafter ADC). Of the first phase of its activity, 376 *procesos*, all but 6 on the count of Judaizing, survive, culminating in 127 actual executions (2 in effigy). For the period 1509-1530, 748 *procesos* survive, 62 of which not on the count of Judaizing, culminating in 96 actual executions (5 in effigy), only one not for Judaizing. At a 1518 *Auto de Fe*, of 30 persons sentenced, 16 were actually executed, 7 posthumously consigned to the flames. See D. PÉREZ RAMÍREZ, *Catálogo del Archivo de la Inquisición de Cuenca* (Madrid 1982), published together with a reprint of S. CIRAC ESTOPAÑÁN, *Registros de los documentos del Santo Oficio de Cuenca y Sigüenza* (Cuenca-Barcelona 1965). The Cuenca tribunal renewed persecution of native Cuencans, on the count of Judaizing, with great cruelty and intensity, during the period 1718-1725. For instance, at the Cuenca *Auto de Fe* on July 23, 1724, 7 persons perished on this count, after having suffered two years of inhuman captivity and excruciating torture. See ADC leg. 579, no. 7100; leg. 588, no. 7144 analyzed by H. CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, “Manuel de Castro (autor del soneto de la Celda del Castillo), su vida y tragedia. Últimos reductos del criptojudasmo en Cuenca,” *Cuenca* 36 (1990), 29-50.

## 2. THE VILLANUEVAS OF QUINTANAR, INTERRELATED WITH THE DE MORA CLAN

In 1491 the Cuenca Inquisition was conducting a posthumous trial on the count of Judaizing against one Fernán Sánchez de Villanueva of Quintanar, nicknamed “Daviuelo” (a diminutive of his original first name David) who had died 35 years earlier (1456).<sup>13</sup> On Saturday, April 30, 1491, an Inquisitor delegated by the Cuenca tribunal heard testimony in Quintanar. His son, Pero Rodríguez de Villanueva, a resident of Quintanar, registered the earliest accusation incriminating the defendant’s memory. He stated that as a “youth of marriageable age” he had seen his father reading from a Hebrew Psalter.<sup>14</sup> According to a document produced by the same tribunal, Pero Rodríguez de Villanueva died c. 1482.<sup>15</sup> Fernán’s grandson Pedro de Villanueva (son of Pero Rodríguez de Villanueva) declared in 1491 that his grandfather had turned Christian at the age of 40 and lived over 40 years as a Christian, which means he was born before 1376 and converted during Vicent Ferrer’s itinerant campaign, c. 1412-1414.<sup>16</sup>

In Quintanar on July 8, 1491 Juana de la Serna, wife of García de Céspedes of Quintanar, declared to the Inquisitor that some 30 years earlier (c. 1461) she was married to Fernán Sánchez’s son Gonzalo, following which they lived in Fernán’s house for about a year and a half. During that time they noticed him continually praying from Hebrew books, especially on Saturdays and making typically Jewish head movements. On Saturdays, he would send to the synagogue for a certain book they were reading there, and he would not eat until the Jews were leaving the synagogue. On those days, he and his wife Elvira Sánchez would eat meat slaughtered by Jews with which his wife had made *adafina* on Fridays. If ever she neglected to prepare it, he would send for some from his wife’s sister Çagbona, who had remained a Jewess. On other days, he would eat meat and poultry only if his sons Pero Rodríguez or Alvar Sánchez had done the slaughtering with a knife belonging to his wife, which she would check beforehand for notches. Moreover, Fernán observed the Jewish holy days as he did the Jewish Sabbath by remaining

<sup>13</sup> See ADC leg. 32, no. 557.

<sup>14</sup> See “Proceso Original que la Inquisición de Valladolid hizo al maestro Fr. Luis de León, religioso del orden de S. Agustín [1572-1577],” *CODOIN* 10 (Madrid 1847) [hereafter *Proceso Original*]: 147. See now also Ángel ALCALÁ, *Proceso Inquisitorial de Fray Luis de León, Edición paleográfica, anotada y crítica* ([Valladolid] 1991), 677 [hereafter ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, with the corresponding page number].

<sup>15</sup> *Proceso Original*, 159 ; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 685.

<sup>16</sup> *Proceso Original*, 150 ; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 679. He converted with his wife and three sons. The couple had three more children after their baptism.

in bed the whole day and praying more than usual. He would not eat pork or permit anyone to cook it in his pots, nor would he eat fish without scales.<sup>17</sup>

The Inquisition was simultaneously conducting a posthumous trial on the count of Judaizing against Fernán's wife, Elvira Sánchez.<sup>18</sup> Here too Juana de la Serna was a prime witness for the prosecution. She recounted to the Inquisitor that during a drought the Jews of Quintanar had taken the Tora (scroll of the Law) out of the synagogue and carried it in procession through the streets of the town, while praying for rain. According to Juana, her late mother-in-law, as the Tora was passing by, fell to her knees, kissed it and ordered Juana and servants accompanying her to do the same. When Juana asked: "Why should we humble ourselves? It belongs to the Jews!" Elvira Sánchez had replied that their Law was greater and that ours was derived from it. When Fernán Sánchez quarreled with his wife, she would say: "Leave me alone; you made me turn Christian! What a good Law I had!" She would only eat meat slaughtered by her sons Pero Rodríguez and Álvaro.<sup>19</sup>

On September 14, 1491, Fernán's grandson Pedro de Villanueva of Quintanar presented the inquisitorial prosecutor with a defense, in writing, of his grandparents. He denied that his grandfather had said that he was proud of his nickname "Daviuelo" because it was Jewish; that he was hapless for having turned Christian; that he was burdened with the 60 souls Jacob had taken to Egypt; that like a good Jew his only wealth was the Law of Moses. Not only had he never said any of this, not only was he far from proud of his former Jewish nickname, but after turning Christian he had actually killed someone who dared to call him by it. His only pleasure was to proclaim himself a Christian. He exerted himself in convincing other Jews to do the same and it was due to him that his wife and three sons had themselves baptized in order to save their souls. After his conversion, he never had any other Law than that of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ. This is what he proclaimed in public and in private, confessing and taking communion every year. He had all the children born to him after his conversion baptized, confirmed, tonsured, sent to church for instruction in Catholic doctrine. He bestowed charitable gifts on Christians, largesse on the church and hermitages of Quintanar, observed and made his household observe Lent and other Catholic fasts. His grandmother, like his grandfather, converted at the age of 40 and she was instrumental in convincing her children to convert.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> *Proceso Original*, 147-148; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 677-678.

<sup>18</sup> See ADC leg. 30, no. 511.

<sup>19</sup> *Proceso original*, 150-151; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 679.

<sup>20</sup> *Proceso original*, 149, 151; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 677, 679.



All to no avail: at the Cuenca *Auto de Fe* of June 29, 1492 Fernán Sánchez de Villanueva “Daviuelo” and Elvira Sánchez were declared to have died apostate heretics, all their worldly possessions forfeited to the Crown and their disinterred remains consigned to the flames.<sup>21</sup>

The Cuenca Inquisition was conducting a posthumous trial in 1499 against Fernán’s son Pero Rodríguez de Villanueva, the same who died *c.* 1482 and supposedly in 1481 denounced his father posthumously for Judaizing. On April 27, 1491 a Jew from nearby Alcázar, Ysaque abén Xuxén (who upon his conversion in 1492 took the name Alonso de Solís), testified. Some 20 years earlier in Quintanar (*c.* 1471), he told the Inquisitor, in the course of a conversation, Pero had exclaimed: “By the life of Adonai in whom you believe and I believe, that’s the truth!” Around the same time in the town of Mota, where they had gone to flee the plague in Quintanar, he bumped into Pero in the street, on his way to visit Ysaque’s sister. Pero said: “May God forgive my father! How well off we were when we were all Jews!” Pero’s grandson Gavriel de Villanueva (the son of Fernando de Villanueva “el Caballero”) came to the defense of his grandfather’s memory, denying any heretical action on his part. On March 23, 1499 the tribunal posthumously absolved him.<sup>22</sup>

Pero’s daughters Leonor de Villanueva and Juana Rodríguez de Villanueva, on a proclamation in Quintanar of the Edict of Faith and the subsequent “period of grace,” had come forward to confess having “unintentionally” observed Jewish fasts. Many years later, in 1510, the Inquisition put both women, by then widows over seventy, on trial for heresy. In 1510, also, Pedro de Villanueva, Daviuelo’s grandson who had defended him in 1491, was tried and penanced for holding offices prohibited to the descendant of a convicted heretic. In 1519 he was posthumously tried and executed in effigy at a Cuenca *Auto de Fe*.<sup>23</sup>

Doña Çinhá, daughter of D. Mosé Abraualla of Quintanar,<sup>24</sup> presently married to Yuzaf abén Lupe of Alcázar, had denounced Leonor and Juana, in 1491. She stated that 35 or 40 years earlier (1451-1456), when the girls were teen-agers, they and their parents used to fast on *el día mayor* (the chief day) and other Jewish fast days. Çinhá also “recalled” sending their family bowls of *adafina* on Saturdays. Elvira, the wife of Juan de Mendoza, denounced Leonor in 1491. She purportedly had gone more than 30 years earlier with her mother,

<sup>21</sup> *Proceso original*, 150-152; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 679-680.

<sup>22</sup> *Proceso original*, 152-153; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 680-681.

<sup>23</sup> ADC leg. 59, no. 866; leg. 73, no. 1071, that require further study and analysis.

<sup>24</sup> She was one of the sisters of Elvira Sánchez who remained Jewesses, the others being Çagbona and Paloma.



Mari Rodríguez, to visit the Abén Xuxens on the death of their child and had participated with Jewish women in the ritual washing of the corpse. Leonor and Juana, pronounced guilty of heresy, were reconciled at the Cuenca *Auto de Fe* of April 18, 1512 and sentenced to the loss of all their property, reclusion and the wearing of the *sambenito* “in perpetuity.”<sup>25</sup>

At the Cuenca *Auto de Fe* of February 3, 1521 their brother Fernando de Villanueva “el Caballero” (1430-1480), who had lived in Toboso, his wife, Catalina Alonso, and his parents-in-law, were executed in effigy, their mortal remains disinterred and burnt. The main accusation stemmed from Judá Alfandará, a Jewish inhabitant of Quintanar. He told the Inquisitor on April 26, 1491 that Fernando had shouted to him from the door of his house in Toboso more than 10 years earlier. His offending words were: “Come over here, Juda; your and my grandmothers were sisters and may God forgive my grandfather Fernán Sánchez who told me to throw a cart-load of earth into the pit where they would bury him, so he wouldn’t be buried in that *temehá* (Hebrew: polluted) earth.”<sup>26</sup>

Fernán Sánchez de Villanueva “Daviuelo” and Elvira Sánchez were among the ancestors of the Augustinian friar Luis de León (1527-1591). A native of Belmonte near Quintanar, De León – Hebraist, classicist and poet – taught Scripture and theology at the University of Salamanca. Arrested by the Valladolid Inquisition in 1572, Fray Luis spent the next five years in a dank cell. The charges were: criticizing the accuracy of the Vulgate on the basis of the original Hebrew; translating the Song of Songs directly from Hebrew into Spanish; being the great-great-grandson of Judaizing heretics whose disinterred remains had been burnt at the stake.<sup>27</sup> Two Villanueva sisters, Catalina and María of Alcázar de Consuegra, married the brothers Diego de Mora and Francisco de Mora the Elder of Quintanar during the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>28</sup> I surmise that their

<sup>25</sup> See *Proceso original*, 159-161; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 685-686.

<sup>26</sup> See *Proceso original*, 162-163; ALCALÁ, *Proceso*, 687.

<sup>27</sup> Fr. Luis’s father, Lope de León, was the son of Gómez Hernández de León, who was the son of Leonor Rodríguez de Villanueva, who was the daughter of Pero Rodríguez de Villanueva, the son of Fernán Sánchez de Villanueva “Daviuelo.” Most of the preceding information derives from excerpted *procesos* transmitted by the Cuenca Inquisition to the Valladolid tribunal and included in Fr. Luis de León’s *proceso* in order to prove his *converso* and *ipso facto* remote Jewish descent. See also C. CARRETE PARRONDO & M.<sup>a</sup> F. GARCÍA CASAR, “Las raíces judías de fray Luis de León,” *La Ciudad de Dios* 204 (May-December 1991), 587-591; C. CARRETE PARRONDO, “Acerca de la genealogía judaica de Fray Luis de León: Elvira de Villanueva,” *Insula* 539 (November 1991), 3-4.

<sup>28</sup> See H. CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía de Antonio Enríquez Gómez, Alias don Fernando de Zarate* (Cuenca 1992), 111; RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 103; M. GHAZALI, “L’inquisition: un pouvoir au service d’une politique de répression et d’acculturation catholique.

grandfather, Juan Pérez de Villanueva, cloth merchant of Alcázar married to the Old Christian María de Molina, was the son of Diego López de Villanueva, who was the second son of Fernando de Villanueva “el Caballero.” Thus, like all the Villanuevas of the region, they were also descendants of Fernán Sánchez de Villanueva “Daviuelo.”

While María de Villanueva tells the Inquisitors at her first session that:

[...] todos los que tiene dichos [i.e. sus ascendientes] son conversos de su generación, decendientes de nuevamente convertidos de judíos, excepto María Molina, abuela materna, montañesa.<sup>29</sup>

Her sister, Catalina de Villanueva, wife of Francisco de Mora the Elder, claimed for all the same ancestors blood entirely free of Jewish dross; none had ever been condemned or penanced by the Holy Office:

[fueron sus ascendientes] de lado paterno y materno labradores limpios como el oro que corre.<sup>30</sup>

### 3. THE LÓPEZ OF CIUDAD REAL AND THE MORAS OF CÓRDOBA, QUINTANAR AND ALCÁZAR

At Ciudad Real on August 4, 1484, just one year into operation, Spain’s third regional inquisitorial tribunal summoned the wife of “Diego, the money-changer” to defend the memory of her parents, Pedro López Farín and his wife Catalina López. The couple was condemned; their mortal remains exhumed and burnt at the Toledo *Auto de Fe* of March 15, 1485.<sup>31</sup>

L'exemple d'El Toboso, village de La Manche,” in J. P. Sánchez (ed.), *L'Inquisition espagnole et la construction de la monarchie confessionnelle, 1478-1561* (Nantes 2002), 166-216: 192-195.

<sup>29</sup> ADC leg. 319, no. 4606, first hearing, 14 October 1589. The dictionary meaning of *montañesa* is “from the region of Santander” in Northwestern Spain, which supposedly never had a Jewish population. It should be noted that neither sister in the course of her confessions attributes any Jewish customs or liturgy to her Villanueva forbears. Throughout this essay, with a few exceptions, I have modernized and made uniform the spelling, accentuation and punctuation of 16<sup>th</sup>-century Spanish texts.

<sup>30</sup> ADC leg. 328, no. 4705, 20 June 1588, 137. Her sister María tells the Inquisitors that her father manufactured salpêtre at Alcázar.

<sup>31</sup> This was indirectly cited by V. PARELLO, “Los Mora de Quintanar de la Orden: un cripto-judaísmo familiar a finales del siglo XVI,” *Sef* 61 (2001), 395-416: 398, n. 7-8. Cf. H. BEINART, *Records of the Trials of the Spanish Inquisition in Ciudad Real* (Jerusalem 1981), vol. IV, 477.

On April 12, 1486 Hernando de Mora (married to Catalina González), a merchant-shopkeeper in the spice trade residing in Alcázar, presented himself voluntarily before the Toledo Inquisitors during the “period of grace” subsequent to the reading of the Edict of Faith in the town. In order to forestall arrest and obtain reconciliation he confessed his heretical act(s). He identified his parents (-in-law?): Juan González and Mari González deceased.<sup>32</sup> The document does not reveal the nature of his “heretical act” nor does it specify whether he was an Old or New Christian.<sup>33</sup>

Nine years later, in 1495, Hernando de Mora and his wife paid the inquisitorial tribunal at Toledo 2.000 maravedís. This payment was made in order to regain for themselves and their descendants the right to use and adorn themselves with silk, gold, silver and precious stones, possess arms, mount horses and enjoy all other privileges. Such privileges were statutorily prohibited to persons reconciled or condemned by the Inquisition, as well as to their children and grandchildren.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 506: [...] *dice que su padre se llamaba Juan González y su madre Mari González, difuntos* [...]. However, this declaration is not part of the 1573 copy of the 1496 sentence, but a supplemental paraphrase of Hernando de Mora’s 1486 declaration. It seems to me that Hernando de Mora, married to Catalina González, was not the son but the son-in-law of Juan González and Mari González. Francisco de Mora the Elder states on June 20, 1588 that his parents were Juan de Mora, born in Córdoba and Mari López, born in Ciudad Real. He identifies his paternal grandfather as Hernando de Mora and a paternal aunt as María de Mora, married to Juan González de la Membrilla, cobbler (see ADC leg. 711, no. 753; cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 102). This was apparently another Juan González. To add to the confusion, the posthumous *proceso* of Juan González, *procurador* of Alcázar, executed in effigy at Toledo in 1496 (AHN leg. no. 154, 365), alternately identifies his wife as Inés López and Catalina López, his daughters as Beatriz and Juana. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 102 states that Mari López, daughter of Pedro López Farín and Catalina López, married Juan de Mora, Hernando de Mora’s son. See AMIEL, “Marranisme” II, 537. Cf. AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 233, n. 72 and RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 119, 121.

<sup>33</sup> According to the secretary of the Toledo tribunal who located Hernando de Mora’s *proceso* at Toledo in 1588, this information was not included in “old-style” trials. See AMIEL, “Marranisme” II, 536-537. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 117 informs that he was one of 5.200 New Christians from the Archbishopric of Toledo reconciled at spectacular ceremonies in 1486-1487.

<sup>34</sup> PARELLO, “Los Mora,” 398, citing F. CANTERA BURGOS and P. LEÓN TELLO, *Judaizantes del arzobispado de Toledo habilitados por la Inquisición en 1495 y 1497* (Madrid 1969), 98. However, Parello confused Fernando de Mora and Catalina González, his wife, who paid 2.000 mrs., with Fernando de Moya and Isabel Rodríguez his wife, who paid 3.000 mrs., both on p. 98 of *Judaizantes del arzobispado de Toledo*. According to this work, at the close of the 15<sup>th</sup> century over 30% of the inhabitants of Alcázar (c. 355 persons or 79 *vecinos*) were reputed *conversos*. It would be interesting to ascertain what percentage was of pre-1492 vintage. I know of no similar study covering the bishopric of Cuenca, to which Quintanar belonged. Such statistics would well serve a correct assessment of its “Marranism.”

Yet, only a year later, at the Toledo *Auto de Fe* of October 25, 1496, Hernando de Mora was sentenced to execution (garroting and burning at the stake) for relapsing into “heresy and apostasy” and denying all the charges. The death sentence indicts him of slaughtering poultry in the Jewish fashion, abstaining from pork, observing the Jewish festivals and maintaining close relations with the Jewish community before its expulsion. Someone had even overheard him say in 1492, apropos a decision by certain Jews to convert:

[...] Sobre algunos judíos que se habían tornado cristianos, decía el dicho: ¡Qué antojo les tomó, o qué bien vieron! ¡Vinieran a mí, que yo trocara con ellos la Ley! [...] al tiempo que los judíos fueron echados del reino, les decía que para qué andaban tristes [...] que plugiera a Dios que fuera él que desterraban y echaban así, deseando él ser judío, y que por tal le mandaran ir fuera del reino, para se ir a Judea donde libremente pudiera ser judío [...] que los lugares que habían sido sinogas eran santos [...] que los herejes que quemaban no tenían culpa e iban tan salvos como los antepasados [...].<sup>35</sup>

At the (same?) Toledo *Auto de Fe* of 1496 Hernando de Mora’s father (-in-law?), the *procurador* Juan González, who had died (as we have seen) before 1486, was executed in effigy, his exhumed bones burnt at the stake.<sup>36</sup>

The preceding calls for comment. With Juan González, Mari González, Pedro López Farín and Catalina López we have the oldest presently known ancestors of the Mora clan of Quintanar and Alcázar, up for intensive inquisitorial persecution at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Since all these people were Christians long before 1486, it is obvious that they were not “Jews who in the times of the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella had joined the Catholic Church,” thus belying and, in fact, invalidating Páramo’s *obiter dictum*.<sup>37</sup>

Now let us look at Amiel’s assessment of these 15<sup>th</sup>-century ancestors of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century subjects of his study:

<sup>35</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 118-119 (French translation) and the almost complete original Spanish text from ADC leg. 331, no. 4733, ff. [21-22] (Juan de Mora Carrillo) in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 505-506; AMIEL, “Marranisme” II, 536 provides an abbreviated text in the original Spanish and French translation. Cf. PARELLO, “Los Mora,” 397-398. The original may also be found in ADC leg. 748 B, no. 100, 169-267: 249-251) (second part of *proceso* of Francisco de Mora *el viejo*).

<sup>36</sup> See AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 215; PARELLO, “Los Mora,” 398.

<sup>37</sup> One wonders whether, in the final analysis, Páramo’s work deserves the encomium bestowed upon it by Amiel (“a unique mine on the beginnings of the Inquisition”) and the annotated anthology he intends to distill from it. See his “Marranisme” I, 201-202.

Along with the name of the most distant ancestor of the Alcázar / Quintanar community we also have, inscribed in the tormented life of Hernando de Mora and the desperate remarks he made to the Jews on the eve of their departure, the proof of a Marranism which antecedes the Expulsion, an autochthonous and very ancient marranism [...].<sup>38</sup>

Amiel implicitly accepts the essential probity of the inquisitorial prosecution's indictment. Yet the prosecution's case rested on nothing but gossip and inuendo. There was no question of facts verified by a confrontation of depositions. The "charges" were merely denunciations strung together, their number corresponding to the number of denunciators.<sup>39</sup> The initial period of the Spanish Inquisition is especially notorious for its institutionalized credulity and utter lack of judicial objectivity.<sup>40</sup> It would seem that his "relapsing" sealed the fate of Hernando de Mora as it did of so many others. The first three denunciations (Judaic slaughter of poultry, failure to spoon pork, the observance of Jewish festivals) are the usual statutory "crimes" echoing Torquemada's "Instructions."<sup>41</sup> The "interesting" accusation (which Amiel enthusiastically assigns anthology status)<sup>42</sup> is of remarks supposedly addressed by Hernando de Mora to the departing Jews, whose spontaneity confers on them a genuine touch. However, even granting their authenticity, what do they amount to? In the final analysis,

<sup>38</sup> "Avec le nom de l'ancêtre le plus éloigné de la communauté d'Alcázar / Quintanar, nous avons aussi, inscrits dans la vie tourmentée de Hernando de Mora et les propos désespérés qu'il tenait aux juifs à la veille de l'exil, la preuve d'un marranisme antérieur à l'Expulsion. Marranisme autochtone donc et très ancien [...]." See AMIEL, "Marranisme" II, 537. He seems to have forgotten his acceptance of Páramo's attribution of this marranism to the 1492 converts in his "Marranisme" I, 201, 206.

<sup>39</sup> See A. PÉREZ MARTÍN, "La doctrina jurídica y el proceso inquisitorial," in J. A. Escudero (ed.), *Perfiles jurídicos de la Inquisición española* (Madrid 1989), 279-322. .

<sup>40</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 93. Good examples are the summaries and excerpts of the Villanueva trials cited above. A few of the earliest *procesos* of the pioneer tribunal at Ciudad Real, nearly all resulting in the death sentence, have been published *in extenso* by H. BEINART, *Records of the Trials of the Spanish Inquisition in Ciudad Real (1485-1527)* (Jerusalem 1974-1981), 4 vols. See also the c. 70 trials 1493-1510 analyzed in R. Levine-MELAMMED, "The Judaizers of Alcázar at the End of the Sixteenth Century 'Corks Floating on Water'," in her *Heretics or Daughters of Israel? The Crypto-Jewish Women of Castile* (New York 1999), 154-165 and 235-241.

<sup>41</sup> See H. P. SALOMON, "The 'Monitorio do Inquisidor Geral' of 1536. Background and Sources of Some 'Judaic' Customs Listed Therein," *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* xvii (1982) [= *Homenagem a Léon Bourdon*], 41-64.

<sup>42</sup> "*Une pièce d'anthologie*" (AMIEL, "Marranisme" II, 536). Amiel reproduces in the original Spanish and in French translation "only the most astonishing quips," indicating his omissions by dots.

Hernando de Mora's show of sympathetic solidarity did not impel him to join the Jewish exiles.<sup>43</sup> Also fanciful is the idea of "Judea" as their destination. As shown above, Hernando had been under an inquisitorial cloud since 1486. In 1495, three years after the expulsion, it was worth 2.000 mrs. to him and his wife to regain their yeoman status.

Pedro López Farín and his wife Catalina López, whose mortal remains both suffered incineration at the Toledo *Auto de Fe* of March 15, 1485, had two daughters. Besides the daughter married to Diego, the money-changer, there was Mari López, married to Juan de Mora, of Quintanar, the son of the hapless Hernando de Mora. The Cuenca Inquisition arrested her in 1516. Mari López first denied, then tearfully confessed Judaizing (keeping the Sabbath, washing and salting meat, all taught by her mother)<sup>44</sup> and was reconciled with the concomitant punishments in 1517.<sup>45</sup> There is no documented evidence that the Inquisition ever arrested tried or reconciled her husband, Juan de Mora.<sup>46</sup> It is worth recalling that, according to their son Francisco, Juan de Mora was born in Córdoba and Mari López in Ciudad Real.<sup>47</sup> This would indicate that the Mora clan did not originate in la Mancha at all, thus invalidating *ab initio* the theory of

<sup>43</sup> According to RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 94, the emigration of a substantial number of New Christians "preceded and followed the 1492 expulsion of the Jews" but was apparently not contemporaneous with it. He (imprecisely) cites the late 15<sup>th</sup> century chronicler Pulgar to the effect that 4.000 New Christian families had fled Andalucía (when? where to?).

<sup>44</sup> Since Mari López must have been born *c.* 1480 and her mother died before 1485 it is extremely unlikely that her mother forced her to "Judaize" (especially after her marriage!). She "got away" with implicating only her mother, whose mortal remains had been burnt 32 years earlier and who was thus out of reach of the Inquisition. She declared herself an only child, not revealing the existence of her older sister, married to Diego the money-changer. (I have borrowed this note from RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 449, to 121.)

<sup>45</sup> Her *proceso* is missing. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 120-121; CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 97, 111 (genealogical chart). Excerpted in the first *proceso* of Francisco de Mora Molina (ADC leg. 315, no. 4562) and elsewhere is Mari López's genealogical declaration made on November 22, 1516, wherein she claims that her mother, Catalina López, was reconciled, although she was executed in effigy at Ciudad Real in 1485. She mentions her father, Pedro López Farín as a *vecino* of Ciudad Real without reference to his inquisitorial fate, her husband, Juan de Mora and eight children. Also excerpted in ADC leg. 315, no. 4562 is her "tearful confession" dated November 29, 1516, quoted in French translation only in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 120.

<sup>46</sup> Cordente Martínez's genealogical chart mentions that Juan de Mora was reconciled, but provides neither date nor source. Révah doubts the Inquisition tried him and points out that a number of Mora *procesos* characterize him as antagonistic to Judaic practices (RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 119).

<sup>47</sup> See above n. 32. Révah surmises Juan de Mora was born *c.* 1475, so he was *c.* 11 in 1486 when his father was a denizen of Alcázar. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 442, n. 1 to 102.



its inheriting a local Judaic tradition. As for Ciudad Real, when the Inquisition began its operations there in 1483, there had not been a single Jewish inhabitant for over a century, making it a most unlikely place for the preservation and transmission of Judaic customs and liturgy.<sup>48</sup>

The children of Juan de Mora and Mari López, according to her genealogical declaration of November 22, 1516, were eight in number. She named Hernando de Mora and Pedro de Mora (20);<sup>49</sup> Lope de Mora (18 or 19); Catalina de Mora, Isabel de Mora, Inés de Mora (*pequeñas*). There were “two more small ones” (Diego de Mora and Juan de Mora?)<sup>50</sup>. After the genealogical declaration she was to have four more children: Francisco, Elvira; Mari López, Juana, making a total of twelve.<sup>51</sup>

For almost half a century the tribunal of Cuenca lay dormant, at least in respect to Judaizers. It reared its head – specifically directed at the Moras of Quintanar – in 1564. In that year it began proceedings during an inquisitorial visitation (public reading of the “Edict of Faith” followed by a “period of grace”) in Socuéllanos against Mari López de Mora and Juana de Mora.<sup>52</sup> The next year six children (five sons and one daughter) of Juan de Mora and Mari López presented themselves “voluntarily” before the Cuenca Inquisitors in order to preempt arrest pursuant to denunciation. The latter were conducting a visitation at Campo de Criptana, a village near Alcázar.<sup>53</sup> The daughter confessed to wearing finery. The five sons confessed to holding offices forbidden them, namely those of tax farmers, typically associated with New Christians and, in an earlier era, with Jews. At least two of the five (Hernando and Diego) refer to their tax farming for the king in his capacity as Grand Master of the military

<sup>48</sup> There was, however, a Jewish community in nearby Almagro. See BEINART, *Records of the Trials*. None of the *procesos* transcribed there contain any full prayers.

<sup>49</sup> CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 97. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 442, n. 5, quotes her (discrepant) genealogical declaration of December 1, 1516, which gives Hernando’s age as 21, Pedro’s 20. According to the later (*Un écrivain*, 102), Pedro died before 1565.

<sup>50</sup> RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 442, n. 5 queries this identification made in 1588 by an inquisitorial notary and points out that Mari López had 4 more children subsequent to her bout with the Inquisition.

<sup>51</sup> RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 102-104.

<sup>52</sup> See ADC leg. 232, no. 2919: *suspensio*, inaccessible to Révah (RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 104, 123). This contains the 1564 and 1565 denunciations (washing hands before meals; cooking eggplant in olive oil) of both Mari López de Mora and her sister Juana (married to the brothers Alonso and Juan López de Armenia). The denunciations did not result in arrests or trials.

<sup>53</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 121-123.



Order of Santiago, to which Quintanar belonged and from which it derived its surname: Quintanar de la Orden.<sup>54</sup> Their lineage was their undoing. Their grandparents were Hernando de Mora, executed in 1496, Pedro López Farín and Catalina López, executed in effigy at Ciudad Real in 1485. Their mother was Mari López, reconciled at the Cuenca *Auto de Fe* of 1517, whose *sambenito* was displayed for all time in the church of Quintanar.<sup>55</sup> The confessants and their sanctions in 1565: Lope de Mora, condemned to banishment for six months;<sup>56</sup> Diego de Mora, *inhabilitado* (deprived of privileges);<sup>57</sup> Hernando de Mora II, *inhabilitado*;<sup>58</sup> Juan de Mora, *inhabilitado*, condemned to banishment for six months;<sup>59</sup> Juana de Mora, *inhabilitada*;<sup>60</sup> Francisco de Mora (later known as the Elder, to distinguish him from his brother Diego's son Francisco de Mora Molina), *inhabilitado*.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>54</sup> When the military order of Santiago was attached to the Crown in 1523, the king of Spain assumed the hereditary title of its Perpetual Grand Master.

<sup>55</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 442, n. 2 to 102 (correct 1573 to 1577); 120-122.

<sup>56</sup> See ADC leg. 234, no. 2987. He confessed to having collected various Quintanar taxes. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 102, 122 (original Spanish, P.P.P. 1, 44). He describes his family as *todos confesos y descendientes de judíos*.

<sup>57</sup> See ADC leg. 319, no. 4607 (1592 *proceso* including 1565 “*Causa de inhabilitación*”). He also confessed to having collected various municipal and royal taxes. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 103, 122. Executed in effigy at Cuenca in 1592. The sanction *inhabilitado* seems to imply that the man thus labelled publicly “reverts” to the status that was his to begin with and that had been forgotten.

<sup>58</sup> See ADC leg. 320, no. 4618 (1592 *proceso* including 1565 confession and sanction). He confessed to having presided at local church ceremonies and to having collected some royal taxes. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 102, 122.

<sup>59</sup> See ADC leg. 234, no. 2996. He confessed to collecting Quintanar taxes for two years. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 103, 122. Executed in effigy at Cuenca on August 16, 1592, his posthumous *proceso* is ADC leg. 322, no. 4632 (*ibid.*, 443, n. 4 to 103).

<sup>60</sup> See ADC leg. 235, no. 3010 (PARELLO, “Los Mora,” 415). She confessed to having dressed in finery adorned with silk, gold and silver. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 104, 122. Extracts from her no longer extant later *proceso* for Judaizing may be found in that of her husband, Juan López de Armenia (ADC leg. 283, no. 3946) and in that of Catalina Navarra (ADC leg. 321, no. 4626). She was c. 80 in 1590 and died in her cell shortly after her reconciliation at the 1592 *Auto*.

<sup>61</sup> The 1592 *proceso* of Francisco de Mora the Elder (ADC leg. 711, no. 753) includes his 1565 confession and sanction. As I shall mention further on, at the 1590 Cuenca *Auto de Fe*, tied to the stake awaiting the garrot, Francisco de Mora the Elder was murdered by the mob of spectators. See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 45; cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 134. My colleague William Childers uncovered a document (AHN Órdenes Militares, Archivo Histórico de Toledo 22.013) concerning 1563 litigation between Francisco and the *consejo* of Quintanar, involving his brother Diego de Mora and his nephew Alonso del Campo. The *Consejo* won, fined Francisco 11.000 mrs. and upon his refusal to pay put his goods and chattel on public auction.

## 4. THE CASE OF ELVIRA DEL CAMPO

On July 5, 1567 the Toledo tribunal arrested a niece, Elvira del Campo, indicted her for “observing the Law of Moses” and reconciled her at an *Auto de Fe* in 1568.<sup>62</sup> In many ways, hers is a paradigmatic case of inquisitorial “Marranism.”<sup>63</sup>

Elvira was a daughter of Diego del Campo, a storekeeper, and Isabel de Mora, one of the children of Juan de Mora and Mari López who were dead by 1565. Elvira was born in Quintanar c. 1531 (1526?), married to Alonso de Moya, an *escribano* (notary public) (Old Christian?)<sup>64</sup> and lived with him successively in the neighboring towns of Alcázar, Villafranca and Madrideojos. The principal “crimes,” reported by servants and employees, were variations on the classical ones found in any Edict of Faith: refusing to eat or even handle pork; abstaining from working on Saturday; putting on a clean blouse on that day. At c. 36 (41?) she was pregnant and proceedings were delayed until she gave birth in prison. She admitted to abstaining from pork, but explained her repugnance medically. She identified six of her twelve denouncers but impugned only the two most

<sup>62</sup> See AHN Inq., leg. 138, no. 7. H. C. LEA, *A History of the Inquisition of Spain* (New York 1907), vol. 3, 233-234, specifies Toledo, June 13, 1568. Cf. AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 234. As I shall mention further on, she was executed as a relapsed heretic at the 1592 Cuenca *Auto*. Amiel (“Marranisme” I, 225) states she was reconciled at Toledo in 1568, with a reference to ADC Libro 352 (*Relación de las causas pendientes en el Santo Oficio de la Inquisición de Cuenca*). RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 107, 123-125, 444 is based on Lea’s analysis of the 1568 *proceso* and mentions her 1592 execution. The corresponding *proceso* is presumed lost. However, an extensive part is excerpted among the preliminary denunciations in the 1591 trial of her sister Inés del Campo (ADC leg. 320, no. 4620, ff. 50v-61r), where Elvira gives her age as 65 (*sesenta y cinco años, poco más o menos*: deposition of June 17, 1591). This provides as the year of her birth c. 1526, which Révah & Wilke gives as c. 1531, based on her first *proceso*. Francisco de Mora Molina in his last minute confession at the *Auto* of August 12, 1590 will mention her 1568 reconciliation. In his second trial, he retracts his denunciation of her in view of her earlier reconciliation, which implies the death sentence as a relapsed heretic were she to be again denounced. See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 38, 42.

<sup>63</sup> See LEA, *A History of the Inquisition*, *loc. cit.*; RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 123-124. An annotated transcription of the entire *proceso* is a desideratum.

<sup>64</sup> Their daughter (?) Catalina de Moya states in her 1590 Toledo trial that she is of the *casta de mercaderes* (caste of merchants). She goes on: *que si es de cristianos viejos o nuevos no lo sabe distinguir, que en Alcázar llaman a los moriscos cristianos nuevos*. Their daughter (?) María de Moya, however, simply identifies herself as of the *casta de conversos*. See ADC leg. 321, no. 4626 (Catalina Navarra, introductory denunciations). Catalina Navarra’s husband Pedro del Campo, *regidor* of Quintanar, refers in his *proceso* for concealment (ADC leg. 327, no. 4690, September 25, 1592) to his servant María de Moya, reconciled by the Toledo tribunal, as “the daughter of so-and-so or rather Cristóval de Moya.”

damaging ones. Twelve out of her thirteen character witnesses – priests and neighbors – confirmed her reputation as a good and scrupulous Christian; one claimed insufficient knowledge to comment. The Inquisitors decided to submit her to torture. On April 6, 1568, the session began with 16 turns of the cords on the arms while the victim was standing. Then the Inquisitors ordered her laid on the rack for more turns, culminating in the water-torture (a jar of water forced down the gullet). She failed to identify the Law of Moses as the motive for her abstention. The passionless business-like description by the inquisitorial notary of this torture session, recorded in her trial-record, was translated into English by Lea and included as the pathetic nadir of his chapter on torture in his monumental *History of the Inquisition of Spain*.<sup>65</sup>

On April 10, torture resumed. It stopped when she confessed that at age 11, her mother had taught her to abstain from pork and observe the Sabbath. She further admitted to having been quite aware that all these things were in violation of Christianity. The next day Elvira modified and ratified her confession to the taste of the Inquisitors: pork abstention and work abstention on Saturday and wearing a clean blouse on that day “were things taught her by her mother in observance of the Law of Moses.” She never revealed (?) these practices to a soul, for her father would have killed her and she stood in terror of her husband. The Inquisitors and deputies voted to grant her reconciliation, penance and loss of all property (one Inquisitor demurred, demanding the death sentence) at the Toledo *Auto* of June 13, 1568.

Henry C. Lea doubted the veracity of Elvira’s invocation of her mother’s teaching, noting that her mother had died precisely when Elvira was eleven.<sup>66</sup> One comes away from the description of the torture session and Lea’s analysis of her case with the impression that Elvira was a pious Christian, and that the Inquisition violently imposed her “Marranism” on her. The French historian Israel Révah, on the other hand, accepted the reality of “Marranism” as the corner stone of all his work on the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. Yet even he reckoned Elvira’s confession bogus: not, however, as something imposed on her by the Inquisition, but as her tactic to avoid revealing to the Inquisitors living “accomplices” in Quintanar and Alcázar, sharing her profound, extensive Judaic, and *ipso facto* anti-Catholic beliefs and practices.

<sup>65</sup> *A History of the Inquisition*, vol. 3, pp. 24-26. Cecil Roth (*The Spanish Inquisition* [New York 1937], 99-104) borrowed it as “the most detailed of the sort available in English.”

<sup>66</sup> I assume the *proceso* to be the source of Lea’s information, but I have not located it there. Supposing her to be eleven when her mother died, if Elvira were born c. 1531 her mother would have died in 1542; if Elvira were born c. 1526 her mother would have died in 1537. However, her brother Rodrigo was born c. 1545.

In a letter to the Cuenca tribunal dated Madrid, June 16, 1572, the *Consejo* complained that:

[...] personas que notoriamente son descendientes de generación de judíos han hecho y hacen informaciones así para pasar a Indias como para otros efectos en las cuales prueban de cristianos viejos, limpios de toda raza de judíos y moros. Ha parecido que de aquí adelante esteis, Señores, advertidos de esto, para que haciendo los tales, hijos y nietos o descendientes de condenados y reconciliados las dichas informaciones falsas, procedeis contra ellos y contra los testigos que depusieron en ellas.

On August 1, 1572 the Cuenca tribunal received a letter from Damián Gallardo, royal notary and familiar of the Holy Office in Quintanar, concerning certain persons of Quintanar who have tried to pass themselves off as Old Christians:

[...] siendo hijos y nietos de quemados y ensanbenitados, que tienen los sanbenitos [de] sus antepasados en esta iglesia; de lo cual ha habido grande escándalo en esta villa, diciendo que cada cual probará lo que quisiera de aquí adelante.

Juan de Mora Carrillo, a “notary public royal” in Huete, was the son of Lope de Mora who was banished from Quintanar in 1565. Juan was arrested and sentenced to two years of banishment from Huete in 1573 for having dissimulated his New Christian status and broken the rules of disqualification when applying for his post. He was executed in effigy on December 13, 1598. In the title of his posthumous *proceso* he is designated a Jew:

Juan de Mora, difunto, vecino y escribano de la ciudad de Huete y natural del Quintanar de la Orden de Santiago. Fue penitenciado porque siendo judío se hizo escribano con información falsa de Cristiano Viejo. Es hijo de Lope de Mora quemado y nieto de Mari López.<sup>67</sup>

There is renewed inquisitorial activity in Quintanar in 1579. The Cuenca tribunal is collecting declarations concerning Judaizing on the part of Diego de Mora, married to María de Villanueva from Alcázar and 6 of their 7 children: María, Catalina, Francisca, Luisa, Juan, Isabel (María and Francisca married

<sup>67</sup> See ADC leg. 331, no. 4733 (including his 1573 and posthumous 1598 *procesos*). Cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 106, 125. A son of Juan de Mora who wished to become a cleric is also mentioned as falsely pretending to Old Christian status. Parello inexplicably writes that “it is obvious that the Moras enjoyed an inquisitorial truce 1520-1580” (“Los Mora,” 402).

to Pedro and Hernando de Sauca) as well as Luisa de Mora, their first cousin, daughter of Diego's brother Juan de Mora II.<sup>68</sup> Diego de Mora, we may recall, was a son of Mari López and Juan de Mora, a grandson of Hernando de Mora and, through his mother, a grandson of Pedro López Farín of Ciudad Real and Catalina López. In other words, he was the son of a person sentenced and a grandson of persons executed in the flesh and in effigy at an *Auto*. In a small town such as Quintanar<sup>69</sup> the contingent of Moras, whose numbers and economic self-sufficiency were steadily increasing, would not have lived down their inquisitorial stain. As noted above, the *sambenito* worn by Mari López at the *Auto* of 1516 hung in the church of Quintanar. In a society with no Jews after 1492,<sup>70</sup> these New Christians from way back all passed for Jews, the "Jews of Quintanar."<sup>71</sup>

During April-May 1585 the Cuenca Inquisition conducted a visitation at Villanueva de Alcardete, a small town near Quintanar.<sup>72</sup> Inquisitor Alonso Jiménez de Reinoso<sup>73</sup> was collecting testimony against Diego de Mora's brother

<sup>68</sup> See AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 215, 230. Révah's list of the children of Diego de Mora and María de Villanueva (RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 110-111), which of course includes Francisco de Mora Molina, includes but minimal information culled from their *procesos*.

<sup>69</sup> Quintanar in 1575 had 594 *vecinos* or between 2228 and 2673 inhabitants. See AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 213.

<sup>70</sup> Quintanar obviously had a substantial Jewish community. On my visit to the town in May 2003 I was shown "the site of the synagogue." A denunciator of María de Mora (ADC leg. 313, no. 4549, May 14, 1588) declares that "on the days of Our Lady which fell on Saturday she would be idle and have a mass said in the hermitage of Our Lady of Mercy [*Ermita de Nuestra Señora de la Piedad*]." A marginal note reads: *la sinoga antigua* (the former synagogue). Similarly, when Leonor Ruiz recounts in 1590 her prayer visits to this hermitage, the inquisitorial scribe notes in the margin: *la sinoga quondam* and *allí era la sinagoga*. See ADC leg. 551, no. 6918. Amiel ("Marranisme" I, 211) calls attention to the toponymic "*honsario de los judíos*" (Jewish burial place) near Quintanar. On the involvement of a Jew from Quintanar in the notorious episode of *el niño de la Guardia* (1491), see Alonso de VILLEGAS, *Flos Sanctorum. Segunda Parte* (Toledo 1586), 145.

<sup>71</sup> Francisco de Mora the Elder reports in his *proceso* (ADC leg. 711, no. 753, June 20, 1588) that he and his family are considered *confesos, descendientes de judíos, e que se los dicen en sus caras*. Moreover, a man with whom he quarrelled called him *puto judío* (Jewish faggot) (February 14, 1589).

<sup>72</sup> See ADC Libro 325 (*testificaciones*), ff. 127r-128r; 131r-v; 139r-140r. I am much beholden to Prof. William Childers for sharing with me this product of his research.

<sup>73</sup> Dr. Alonso Jiménez de Reinoso, associate Cuenca Inquisitor since at least 1585, was from c. 1594 head Inquisitor of the Córdoba Tribunal, where his venality and scandalous sex life came to light in 1597. See B. BENASSAR, *L'Inquisition espagnole* (Paris 1979), 88-89 (quoted by RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 449, to 126). Bennassar calls him the "archetype of the overbearing, dissolute Inquisitor."

Francisco de Mora the Elder. On April 16 Juan Hiniesta Sarmiento, *regidor* (alderman) of Quintanar, testified that two years previously a certain Morisca “of those deported from Granada,”<sup>74</sup> a domestic, told him that in Francisco de Mora the Elder’s house, work went on as usual on Sundays. On April 17 one Catalina Patuda, 17, testified that six years previously a certain Morisca, Brianda, told her at the door of her mother’s house that she had gone to fetch a basket of grapes from Francisco de Mora the Elder’s vineyard. She had caught a glimpse of Francisco de Mora the Elder flogging a statue of Christ in a dovecote.<sup>75</sup> Brianda was not able to describe the statue, whether it was small or large or the nature of the scourge. So Catalina accused Brianda of lying, which Brianda denied. On April 27 Brianda, 19, was summoned and retracted her accusation. Questioned whether she remembered “three or four years ago” [!] fetching a basket of grapes from a vineyard belonging to Francisco de Mora and finding him in a dovecote. She replied that she had been there more than four times but never found Francisco in the dovecote, which was always under lock and key. Five or more years previously Antón de la Mota’s daughter, gathering pruned vine-shoots, had asked her whether she had mentioned the flogging and she denied it. Three days later Francisco de Mora’s wife asked her at the door of her house whether she had really said what was attributed to her. When she denied it, Francisco’s wife said that in Rodrigo Gómez’s house opposite hers they claimed she had indeed told them of the flogging and she should go there to check. So Brianda went there and in the courtyard met Rodrigo Gómez, his wife, his son and two daughters. Brianda asked them whether they had quoted her as saying she had seen Francisco flogging a statue of Christ and they denied

<sup>74</sup> After the suppression of the second Morisco uprising of the Alpujarras (1567-1570) thousands of Granada’s Moriscos were deported to northern Spain. A considerable contingent arrived in Quintanar in 1571, where they were worked as menial servants and laborers. In 1594 there were 219 Moriscos in Quintanar. See W. CHILDERS, “‘Según es cristiana la gente’: The Quintanar of *Persiles y Sigismunda* and the Archival Record,” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, 24, 2 (2004), 5-37: 29.

<sup>75</sup> Denunciations of New Christians flogging crucifixes, images and statues of Christ abound in the annals of the Spanish inquisitorial tribunals from 1492 on, later spreading to the Spanish Americas and Brazil. The most famous actual trial on this trumped-up count, known in Spanish history as *El Cristo de la Paciencia*, resulted in the execution of six Portuguese immigrants in Madrid on July 4, 1632. See J. I. PULIDO SERRANO, *Injurias a Cristo, Religión, política y antijudaísmo en el siglo xvii (Análisis de las corrientes antijudías durante la Edad Moderna)* (Madrid 2002). Cf. A. J. SARAIVA, *The Marrano Factory, The Portuguese Inquisition and its New Christians 1536-1765* (Leiden 2001), 203-206; Y. H. YERUSHALMI, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto* (New York 1971), 105-122; D. M. GITLITZ, *Secrecy and Deceit: The Religion of the Crypto-Jews* (Philadelphia 1996), 159-168, 179-182 (this author is inclined to lend credence to the accusations).



it. Brianda, admonished to tell the truth, persisted in her denials. Thus the arrest of Francisco de Mora the Elder temporarily fell through.<sup>76</sup>

##### 5. NET CAST AND HAULED IN

On March 14, 1588 Inquisitor Alonso Jiménez de Reinoso of the Cuenca tribunal sends the *Suprema* in Madrid<sup>77</sup> a bundle of ratified denunciations collected in the course of visitations at Quintanar in 1579 and 1588. The denunciations implicate as Judaizers six children of the late Diego de Mora (all except Francisco de Mora Molina), as well as first cousin Luisa de Mora, unmarried, daughter of Diego's brother Juan. The Inquisitor's arguments for their arrest contained in his covering letter repay careful scrutiny:

“[...] Even though the persons that have been ordered arrested and their belongings sequestered are not very wealthy, nor of as high a rank as is recommended in such proceedings, nevertheless, because of the great number of people that can ultimately be implicated [...] the affair is promising and it is well that you be informed of it from the very start. Although the latest denunciations are somewhat confused and discordant, they are susceptible to modification when the testimonies are ratified. I have not summoned the denunciators to verify their testimony, because if they become aware of our close attention, they might change their testimony. Besides, since the accused are their familiars and friends they could catch fright and change their testimony. Moreover, the Moras being *confesos* [= New Christians] who know the ropes, they could get wise to the case that is being prepared and since the witnesses live in their houses, easily disqualify them. Carrying out the arrests first and subsequently summoning the witnesses against them for ratification of testimony preempt all these risks. Strictly speaking at present, one could justifiably arrest merely María de Mora, wife of Pedro de Sauca, and her cousin Luisa de Mora, who live together and are the only ones against whom there are concurring denunciations. [...] But,

<sup>76</sup> The accusation was of course nevertheless included – duly expanded – among the counts against him in his *proceso*: [...] *Con gran maldad y perfidia le azotaba, pisaba y escarnecía [...] todas las vezes que fue al campo [...]*, cited by PARELLO, “Los Mora,” 405. In my own perusal of the *proceso* I found his denial: *Nunca ha entrado en su palomar crucifixo: and this tacha: Una Brianda morisca dijo en el Quintanar que había visto a este confesante azotar un Cristo y que el fue al Governador y le dijo que hubiese por su honra hacer una información* (June 22, 1588).

<sup>77</sup> The Inquisitor General from April 1573 until his death in November 1594 was Gaspar de Quiroga. See J. PÉREZ VILLANUEVA & B. ESCANDELL BONET (eds.), *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América* (Madrid 1984), vol. I, 768, 769-770.



considering that these people belong to such a despicable race, atavistically inclined to this type of crime [...] by adding up the 1579 denunciations to the present ones, there are enough charges to justify arresting all seven, sequestering their moneys and goods.”<sup>78</sup>

By order of the *Suprema* all seven were arrested on April 25, 1588, taken to the inquisitorial jail in Cuenca and put into separate cells.<sup>79</sup> However, they were not caught unawares. They had been informed of their impending arrest by the denunciators themselves.<sup>80</sup> Let us now take a close look at the denunciations, including some, as is always the case, made subsequent to the arrests. They number around 54 and date from January 10, 1579 through October 10, 1588, deriving from 48 witnesses. All the witnesses are or were residents of Quintanar, their ages ranging from 20 to 77. As to professions (incomplete data): 3 non-professed nuns (*beatas*), 1 priest, 1 “Familiar of the Inquisition,” 1 sheriff (*alguazil*), 1 nobleman, 2 university graduates, 2 tailors, 2 farm laborers, 1 shepherd, 1 servant. The 3 denunciations dated January 1579 (including a certain Pedro Sacristán’s) are based on hearsay deriving from one Juan Sánchez de la Serna (deceased, as it later turned out) and his brother-in-law Rodrigo Quijada. Both had lived in Diego’s house for an unspecified period 1575-1576 and had ample opportunity to observe all the goings-on.<sup>81</sup> Three denunciations are dated Quintanar, January 29, 1588. The first is by Andrés Enríquez, a servant in the house of Diego’s older brother Francisco de Mora the Elder for two years *c.* 1571-1572, *i.e.*, 15 years before the denunciation. The second is by Francisco Sánchez, for nine years, 1573-1582, the shepherd of Diego’s livestock. The third is by Juan de Buenaventura, 20, presently employed by a tailor in Calatayud, 2 years a domestic servant in Diego’s household and 4 in the household of his daughter María de Mora, married to Pedro de Sauca, an Old Christian. Subsequent to his victims’ imprisonment (April 25, 1588), Juan made three depositions that are more substantial: at Calatayud on September 4, and at

<sup>78</sup> I have excerpted and translated from the original Spanish the text in AHN Inq., leg. 2545, no. 125 (see P.P.P. 1, 48-49). It is provided only in French translation in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 126-127. See also Amiel’s French paraphrase “Marranisme” I, 215-216.

<sup>79</sup> [...] *Sin que el uno supiese del otro* [...], so Cuenca Inquisitor Jiménez de Reinoso informs the Madrid *Suprema* in his letter of May 29, 1588, only in French translation in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 128-129. Cf. AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 216-217. Cordente Martínez, (*Origen y genealogía*, 31) however shows that on January 13, 1589 the sisters María and Isabel de Mora (as well as Catalina?) shared a cell.

<sup>80</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 128.

<sup>81</sup> AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 230. These denunciations are described in some detail by CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 29-30 and *passim* by Amiel, *e.g.* “Marranisme” I, 250-251, where he assumes their truthfulness.

Cuenca on September 20 and 23, 1588. Among the countless details of gestures and mannerisms gathered in *six years of close observation* the only ones deemed relevant to Judaizing was the Friday afternoon tidying up and the girls' plunge into the tub after menstruation. Interrogated about suspicious prayers he was only able to produce a few stray meaningless words, which Amiel supposes to be blessings.<sup>82</sup> Amiel neglects to report an interesting denunciation by Marcos García, a Quintanar tailor, dated July 15, 1588:

Todos los Mora se juntaban en el día del Jueves Santo, en que hacían una procesión entre ellos, entretanto que el santísimo sacramento se encerraba. Y que tenían un cordero y lo mataban y que se bebían la sangre que dél sacaban, y que esto lo oyó a su madrastra.<sup>83</sup>

Diego de Mora's daughters María and Francisca had married Old Christians, the brothers Pedro de Sauca and Hernando de Sauca, respectively. When Pedro and Hernando discovered Juan de Buenaventura's hand in the denunciations of their wives, they set out, masked, to find him, force him to retract or else. They tracked him down to a tailor's shop in Zaragoza, but the Inquisition snatched him in Calatayud, taking him into its protection.<sup>84</sup>

The seventh denunciation, dated March 7, 1588, was by Damián Gallardo, Familiar of the Inquisition at Quintanar.<sup>85</sup> Basing himself entirely on what Juan de Buenaventura had told him "confidentially," he produced no eyewitness account of his own concerning Mora Judaizing. He noted that according to common belief in Quintanar all the Mora ancestors were *conversos*, and so was the family of Diego de Mora's wife's family, the Villanueva's, as well as the connected Falcón clan, of Alcázar.<sup>86</sup> He also proffered the patent fib (which Amiel

---

<sup>82</sup> "Marranisme" I, 229-231, based on ADC leg. 748 B, no. 99. Amiel attributes Juan's failure to discover private "Marrano prayers" to a "zone of secrecy" in the respective households, which Juan could not penetrate. There was an additional denunciator, Jerónimo de Sauca, a brother of Pedro and Hernando de Sauca (see next paragraph).

<sup>83</sup> See ADC leg. 319, no. 4606, María de Villanueva, preliminary denunciations.

<sup>84</sup> See AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 231-232 based on ADC leg. 315, no. 4560 (*proceso* of Pedro and Hernando de Sauca). Cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 110-111, based on the same *proceso*, but less informative.

<sup>85</sup> For the role of "Familiars," see Roberto J. LÓPEZ Y LÓPEZ, "El establecimiento y consolidación de la estructura inquisitorial en la Monarquía Hispana," in J. P. Sánchez (ed.), *L'Inquisition espagnole et la construction de la monarchie confessionnelle 1478-1561* (Nantes 2002), 45-72: 68-72.

<sup>86</sup> It would be interesting to determine if any / how many Falcóns had bouts with the Inquisition.

for some reason deems “a piece of precious information”) to the effect that “the Moras took nobody into their employ who was not a relative.”<sup>87</sup> However, the Familiar added, “They are reputed to be nice people, who would never think of harming anyone.”<sup>88</sup>

Amiel rightly considers the Familiar’s attitude benign, especially in light of ADC leg. 713, no. 800. In that document Gallardo is accused by the Cuenca inquisitorial attorney of having alerted members of the Mora clan to their impending arrest, “that he lead some of them to flee and others to hide, sell or otherwise transfer ownership of their property to the great detriment of the Inquisition.” According to a declaration by Francisco de Mora Molina (the one child of Diego de Mora not arrested on April 25, 1588) in his first *proceso*, Gallardo informed him in 1588 of the impending arrest of his siblings, adding confidentially that no one had denounced Francisco. The family had thereupon decided that those denounced, to preempt arrest, had best voluntarily present themselves for reconciliation. At the last moment (they were already en route) it was decided otherwise, because Damián Gallardo, passing by Francisco de Mora Molina in the street, made a gesture of cutting his own throat, signifying that such a voluntary presentation would be suicidal. Some months later, during a chance encounter at the local butcher’s, Gallardo informed Francisco “a devil had got involved” who was pressuring him to send a deposition to the Holy Office. Francisco understood that the devil was none other than Pedro Sacristán (one of the denouncers in 1579) who, on his nightly visits to the Familiar, was egging him on and threatening him with a new denunciation of his own which would presumably include Gallardo.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>87</sup> [...] *nunca se servían de personas estrañas, mozos y mozas, sino de los suyos y de su parentela* [...]. I am assuming that Juan de Buenaventura was not a kinsman. Two and a half years later, on October 18, 1590, an Inquisitor in a letter to the *Suprema* in Madrid, in order to explain how it was possible for the Moras’ confessed Judaic practices to have gone unnoticed by outsiders, echoed Gallardo’s untruth: [...] *como no se sirven de gente de fuera de sus casas, sino sólo de sus hijos* [...]. Révah finds the explanation convincing. See AHN Inq., leg. 2545, no. 179, provided only in French translation in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 136.

<sup>88</sup> [...] *Son tenidos por buena gente, y no hacían mal a nadie, que no eran para ello* [...] (ADC leg. 748 B, no. 99, quoted in the original and in French paraphrase in AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 232). Carsten Wilke, in a recent message to me, points to the less than lukewarm nature of Gallardo’s phraseology.

<sup>89</sup> See AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 232-233, based on ADC leg. 713, no. 800 and ADC leg. 328, no. 4704 (second *proceso* of Francisco de Mora Molina); CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 30, based on ADC leg. 315, no. 4562 (first *proceso* of Francisco de Mora Molina). Pedro Sacristán de Mudarra was Damián Gallardo’s nephew. See ADC leg. 748 B, no. 100 (second part of *proceso* of Francisco de Mora the Elder), 196, 219.

While dismissing some of the denunciations and their authors as mere rumormongers, Amiel considers the following testimony to be one of those that “ring truest” and therefore worth a long paraphrase in his study.<sup>90</sup>

Mari Sánchez, one of the 3 *beatas* who deposed against the Moras in 1588, told of a 5 year friendship with her neighbors Juana and Beatriz de Mora, who lived together. These were the daughters of Diego de Mora’s older brother Hernando de Mora (designated by Révah Hernando de Mora II, to distinguish him from the Hernando de Mora executed in 1496). Mari said they told her that the Moras did not employ maidservants because maidservants tattle on their masters, that a maidservant had denounced their cousin Elvira del Campo of Madrideojos, arrested and condemned by the Toledo Inquisition.<sup>91</sup> Mari Sánchez had noticed that Juana and Beatriz, dressed in their finery, abstained from work on Saturdays but did their sewing on Sundays; ate no bacon; were provided with meat by their family; often fasted; did not sit at the same table, eat from the same dishes or drink from the same glasses as their guests, unless these were relatives. The girls had explained that they avoided intimacy with men and were very finicky eaters. Their conversations were all about Moses, the prophets, the ten plagues, the giving of the Law to Moses, the messianic prophecies. They obviously relished these subjects but if Mari Sánchez would talk about the Passion and Crucifixion, they would change the subject. Neither girl could read, yet they knew all those Old Testament stories. If Mari Sánchez held forth on one of the holy martyrs, they would come up with Moses this and Abraham that, David this and Moses 40 days on the mount that, and they said their father, Hernando de Mora, read to them from books.<sup>92</sup>

It will be recalled that seven Mora family members were arrested by the Cuenca Inquisition on April 25, 1588, namely six of the seven children of Diego de Mora and their first cousin Luisa, daughter of Diego’s brother Juan de Mora. Within the first month of their imprisonment, Diego’s six children had confessed “nearly all they were accused of” and more.<sup>93</sup> Four had made reciprocal denunciations and

<sup>90</sup> Amiel’s criteria for determining a given denunciation’s credibility seem to be entirely subjective.

<sup>91</sup> See above Section 4.

<sup>92</sup> See AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 234-235, based on ADC leg. 748 B, no. 99. For the possible identification of such books, see his “Marranisme” II, 524-534 and below in this article. Amiel does not provide the precise date of this *beata*’s deposition. She made it on June 2, 1588: the first 7 Moras were arrested on April 25.

<sup>93</sup> Diego’s son Juan de Mora, a bachelor of 25 (ADC leg. 348, no. 4587), in spite of his abundant initial confessions (ritual slaughter, Judaic prayers orally and in writing), refused to denounce accomplices and contested his accusers with *tachas*. On August 21, 1589 he was submitted to light torture (he had a maimed arm), *in caput alienum*, which produced 32 reciprocal

all of them attributed their Judaic indoctrination to their late father. But their cousin Luisa, Juan de Mora's daughter, persisted in denying all the accusations. Taken to the torture chamber she confessed to having cooked some lentils (*guisaba unas lentejicas*) for four or five Sabbaths, then revoked her confession.<sup>94</sup>

Only Diego's widow, María de Villanueva and his eldest son, Francisco de Mora Molina were still at large. Francisco, aged 35 in 1588,<sup>95</sup> was married to Leonor Enríquez of Toledo, perhaps an Old Christian.<sup>96</sup> They had two small children: Diego Mora Enríquez and Antonio Mora Enríquez aged seven and five in 1588.<sup>97</sup> Francisco unsuccessfully attempted to find an attorney in Cuenca to provide legal aid to his incarcerated siblings.<sup>98</sup>

---

denunciations. He attempted to correspond with fellow prisoners on pieces of cloth. These were intercepted and included in his sizeable *proceso*, with their transcription.

<sup>94</sup> See the Inquisitor's letter of May 29, 1588 in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 128-129 (Spanish original P.P.P. 1, 50-51). Cf. AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 216-217. Luisa de Mora ultimately revoked her revocation and was reconciled in 1590. See ADC leg. 314, no. 4553. Cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 109. I was struck by the wording of young Jerónimo Zapata Saucá's denunciation to the effect that his sister-in-law María and her house-mate Luisa *guardan el sábado tan bien y mejor que los cristianos el domingo* (keep the Sabbath as well and better than the Christians do Sunday). On September 4, 1588, more than four months subsequent to their imprisonment, one Juan de Lara denounced Luisa and María for "sweeping the kitchen the wrong way on Fridays" (*barría las cocinas al revés los viernes*).

<sup>95</sup> In his *proceso* of 1565 Diego gave the ages of his children as follows: María, c. 20; Catalina, 16-17; Francisco, 14; Francisca, c. 12; Luisa, 8; Juan, 5-6; Isabel, 4. If this is correct, Francisco was born in 1551. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 446, n. 2 to 110. In his first *proceso*, on May 30, 1588 he gave his age as 35. If this is so, he was born in 1553. See *ibid.*, 446 (n. 5 to 110). However, in his second *proceso* of 1590 he declared his age to be "approximately 35." See AMIEL, "Marranisme" II, 490.

<sup>96</sup> She was the daughter of Antonio Enríquez, silversmith of Cuenca, resident in Toledo and his wife Mari Juárez. After Antonio Enríquez's death, his widow Mari Juárez remarried. Her second husband, Francisco de Mora Carrillo (son of Lope de Mora), raised her daughter Leonor Enríquez, which may account for the latter's inquisitorial classification as a New Christian. See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 10, 99-100, 110. Révah, on the other hand, saw in the genealogical inquiry of her *proceso* (ADC leg. 327, no. 4691) that she declared herself an Old Christian and noble on mother's side. But she identified only one of her grandparents. Her husband declared she was of partly New Christian stock on her father's side. Yet her paternal uncle was a "Familiar" of the Inquisition, which implies Old Christian purity. In her sentence, she was charged *inter alia* with misrepresenting herself as an Old Christian. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 110-111; cf. AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 275. On the Cuenca Enríquez's possible illegitimate descent from royalty (through Henry of Trastámara), see CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 88-89.

<sup>97</sup> CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 30-31, 49, 110-111.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.* A clerk who promised to get them out tried to embezzle him.

The denunciations made until that date had not implicated Francisco. However, subsequent ones, as well as the first confessions made by two of his imprisoned sisters, mentioned him. In his letter of May 29, 1588, the Cuenca Inquisitor Jiménez de Reinoso informed the *Suprema* that Francisco was wealthier than all his other siblings together (the confiscation of all their moveable and immovable property had netted only 1.500 ducats). He gloatingly reports that Quintanar expects to be depopulated<sup>99</sup> and that arrests may spread to other important towns in the dioceses of Cuenca and Toledo. Francisco de Mora Molina's arrest had already taken place on May 27, 1588.<sup>100</sup>

Because of earlier and further denunciations (either by those within or without the inquisitorial prison)<sup>101</sup>, early in June 1588 the Inquisition arrested four more Mora family members. They were Diego's brother Francisco de Mora the Elder and his wife Catalina de Villanueva, sister of Diego's widow María de Villanueva; Juana (50?) and Beatriz de Mora (40), unmarried daughters of Diego's brother Hernando de Mora II, denounced, as we have seen, by the *beata* Mari Sánchez.<sup>102</sup> As of December 15, 1588, of 30 prisoners in the inquisitorial dungeon of Cuenca, the only ones indicted on the charge of Judaizing were the 12 Moras. Pedro and Hernando de Sauca, the husbands of María and Francisca de Mora were also imprisoned. Nevertheless, since they were Old Christians, instead of a denunciation for Judaizing they faced the charge of disorderly conduct. The Inquisition freed them on December 22, 1588.<sup>103</sup> The Cuenca Inquisitor

<sup>99</sup> This remark seems to indicate that a goodly part of the population of Quintanar was considered New Christian.

<sup>100</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 128-129 (original Spanish, P.P.P. 1, 51). Cf. AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 216-217, 236-237; CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, "Origen y genealogía", 32.

<sup>101</sup> *Como los vecinos de la dicha villa, después de las prisiones pasadas, han caído en la cuenta, van cada día dando avisos de cosas que han visto hacer y decir a las personas desta parentela.* I quote a letter from Dr. Jiménez de Reinoso to the *Suprema*, dated June 9, 1588, cited in French translation only in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 129-130 (P.P.P. 1, 52 has the Spanish originals of Révah's excerpts from the letters of various Cuenca Inquisitors during 1588-1590, addressed to the *Suprema*, from AHN Inq., leg. 2545: no. 125, 167, 179, where I have consulted them and verified their location).

<sup>102</sup> For the ages of Juana and Beatriz, see RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 443, to 105. Révah places Juana's birth c. 1542. However, at her first session with the Inquisitors (June 22, 1588) she declares her age as "over 50" (see ADC leg. 314, no. 4554).

<sup>103</sup> See AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 218. Cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 110, 130, who provides a different motivation for their arrest, namely an attempt on their part to impede inquisitorial confiscation of their wives' goods. A tacit prescript to the effect that accusations of Judaizing brought against persons of demonstrably clean Old Christian stock were not to be entertained, apparently prevailed in both the Spanish and the Portuguese Inquisitions. See SARAIVA, *The Marrano*



informed the *Suprema* that there were by now sufficient denunciations to arrest other Moras but that neither cell nor staff was available.<sup>104</sup> Diego's widow María de Villanueva, Francisco de Mora Molina's mother, over 70 years old, was taken into custody on October 14, 1589.<sup>105</sup>

The usual 22 more or less stereotypical "denunciations" introduce Francisco de Mora Molina's *proceso*. He denied them all. On June 3, 1588, he countered the accusation of abstaining from pork with the remark "that he had eaten more pork than any Old Christians in the world" (*que ha comido más tocino que cuantos cristianos viejos hay por el mundo*).<sup>106</sup> After a year in the dungeon and continuous confrontation with his siblings' confessions, which implicated him, Francisco de Mora Molina gave up his negative stance only to the extent of admitting that his father had taught him Judaism. The Inquisitors were not particularly happy with this denunciation, since his father being deceased was not subject to arrest. On September 19, 1589, they unanimously voted to have him executed unless he confessed and denounced accomplices. They informed him that torture was in store. On June 18, 1590 the Madrid *Suprema* approved the torture, as well as the execution at the next *Auto* scheduled for August 12, 1590. On July 5, they took him to the torture chamber, strapped him to the rack and gave him twelve turns on the arms and legs, his screams and supplications all recorded by the notary. Upon his persistent denials, it was decided to keep him on the rack and apply the water torture. After ingurgitating a few pitchers of water, he gave in to the extent of denouncing his incarcerated siblings in addition to his deceased father.<sup>107</sup>

## 6. MURDER BY THE MOB ON THE *PLAZA MAYOR*

On July 10, 1590, the Cuenca Inquisitors Francisco de Arganda and Velarde de la Concha reported to the *Suprema*. All had confessed and copiously denounced except Diego's brother Francisco de Mora the Elder, who persisted in denying all

---

*Factory*, 75-76. Cf. J.-P. DEDIEU, *L'administration de la foi, L'inquisition de Tolède, xv<sup>e</sup> - xviii<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Madrid 1989), p. 333: "The same act, committed by an Old or a New Christian, will receive two radically different interpretations. In the first case, for instance, it may be blasphemy; in the second, an indication of judaizing." I thank Dr. Carsten Wilke for this reference.

<sup>104</sup> RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 130; AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 217-218.

<sup>105</sup> See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 32.

<sup>106</sup> See ADC leg. 315, no. 4562, f. 105r.

<sup>107</sup> See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 31-32, based on Francisco's *proceso*. Amiel omits to describe the excruciating torture. Nor does he describe from their *procesos* that of the other two *negativos*.



charges and refusing to denounce other relatives (a stance which almost automatically led to the death penalty) and Diego's son Francisco de Mora Molina. Both men had been tortured. "The old man had the firm resolve to die rather than talk in his confessions, and he carried it out, for he said nothing about anyone. The young one, though he did denounce a couple of people, they were only those whom he knew to be in prison, for their incarceration had preceded his own."<sup>108</sup> On July 25, the same Inquisitor reported his inability to make Diego's niece Beatriz confess under torture,<sup>109</sup> even after they apprised her that her sister Juana's "deposition" and her cousin Francisco de Mora Molina's "declaration"<sup>110</sup> had implicated her. Juana upon being taken to the torture chamber, undressed and having her arms tied had "spontaneously" confessed; actual torture had not been necessary.<sup>111</sup>

On July 29, 1590, 21 more prisoners were brought in from Quintanar, in view of the impending *Auto*, which would empty the cells.<sup>112</sup>

After languishing in jail for over two years, 12 Judaizing Moras (out of a total of 37 victims)<sup>113</sup> heard their sentence at the *Auto*, which was held on the main

<sup>108</sup> "[...] *el viejo fue con presupuesto siempre en sus confesiones de antes morir que declarar ninguna cosa, y así lo ha hecho, que no dijo ninguna cosa de nadie. Y el mozo, aunque declaró contra algunas personas, fueron de las que sabía que estaban presas, por haber precedido la captura de ellas a la suya.*" The Spanish text quoted in French translation only in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 132 (Spanish original P.P.P. 1, 54); cf. a French paraphrase in AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 219.

<sup>109</sup> The letter hints at Beatriz's torture (it was impossible to 'reduce' her), and her *proceso* (ADC leg. 318, no. 4586) specifies and recounts it: *cordel* (turns of the cord) and *jarro de agua* (a jar of water forced down her throat). See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 133. P.P.P. 1, 56 has the original Spanish designations of the torture as noted by Révah.

<sup>110</sup> "*Lo que declaró Francisco de Mora, el moço*": was it an actual denunciation or were the Inquisitors attempting to fool her into thinking it was? According to CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 32, Francisco's torture session ended when he denounced his father and siblings. AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 219, mistakenly designates Francisco Beatriz de Mora's brother.

<sup>111</sup> See the French translation of the letter in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 132; a brief French paraphrase in AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 219.

<sup>112</sup> Two for whom warrants were issued but were not brought in were the brothers Juan and Cristóbal de Mora, sons of Juan de Mora, Diego de Mora's brother. Juan was living in Madrid, fled and disappeared. Cristóbal, a clerk and a soldier of fortune, was on his way to the Spanish garrison in Oran. He presented himself to the Cuenca Tribunal on September 29, 1590 and was reconciled at the 1592 *Auto* (ADC leg. 321, no. 4621). The Judaizing he confessed to consisted of his conversations during his stay in Oran with a few members of its officially tolerated Jewish community. See PARELLO, "Los Mora," 400; RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 109, 133. Cf. AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 224. The paragraph devoted to Cristóbal by GHAZALI, "L'inquisition: un pouvoir," 196 is erroneous.

<sup>113</sup> The figure includes Diego's widow María de Villanueva (ADC leg. 319, no. 4606) but not her sister, Francisco de Mora the Elder's wife Catalina de Villanueva (ADC leg. 328, no. 4705),

square of Cuenca on Sunday, August 12, 1590. Jesuit Father Andrés Ortega, who was to deliver the inquisitorial sermon, described the heart-rending encounter of María de Villanueva and her seven children after 28 months.<sup>114</sup>

The two *negativos*: Francisco de Mora the Elder, Beatriz de Mora and one *diminuto*,<sup>115</sup> Francisco de Mora Molina were to die at the stake, the nine others reconciled (possessions confiscated, varying terms of forced residence in the “penitential prison,” wearing of the *sambenito*).<sup>116</sup>

At the *Auto* itself, between 4 and 5 P.M., Francisco de Mora Molina (i.e., the younger Francisco) was summoned to kneel before the platform to hear his death sentence. The Jesuit Father Andrés Ortega assigned to him interrupted the ceremony to inform the Inquisitors that between midnight and 1 A.M. Francisco, apprised of his impending death, had begged him for absolution. The Jesuit told him that this could only be granted him if he first confessed all he was accused of by the Inquisition. The presiding Inquisitor Arganda came down from the platform and the scribe took down the confession of a kneeling and weeping Francisco immediately. Back on the platform, Arganda went into a huddle with his colleagues: he opined for suspension of the execution because Francisco had made several new revelations and denunciations. “Francisco was an eccentric,

---

who died in prison in 1592. Following a second (posthumous) trial, her execution in effigy and the burning of her disinterred bones took place at the Cuenca *Auto* of December 13, 1598. She had (obviously unsuccessfully) claimed to be of pure Old Christian stock (*limpia*) on both sides. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 104, 133, 137. Révah erroneously states that the Inquisitors suspected her sanity. In reality the Inquisitors suspected her of faking insanity: *Comencó a fingirse loca y a dar a entender que lo estaba, haciendo y diciendo algunos diparates*. As an example, the following: after two years in prison (on May 24, 1590) she asked for an audience and said: “*Pide misericordia a los Señores Inquisidores pues están puestos en lugar de Dios. Que la pide porque por reverencia de Dios todo poderoso y de su misericordia la dejen ir a su casa a ver su marido y hijos y que todo cuanto mandaren sus Señorías, ella lo haría y cumplirá como hija de quien es. Y preguntó cómo estaban los Señores Inquisidores? Y dijo “buenos están.” “El Señor Arganda suele estar flaquito y enbebido, y ahora está fresco. Llevenme por moza a su casa que le serviré yo.’ Que al Señor Inquisidor Arganda le servirá en particular. Fuele dicho que se deje de divertir y trate de su negocio y vea para que ha pedido la audiencia.”*”

<sup>114</sup> See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 45 (for “Villaescusa” read “Villanueva”), 93. María, though reconciled, was also to die in prison between 1590 and 1592. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 103.

<sup>115</sup> Prisoners who refused to confess “their Judaizing,” and unwilling or unable to identify and discredit their accusers were called *negativos*; those who confessed some, all or most of the accusations but were unwilling to implicate friends and relatives still at large were called *diminutos*. Both categories would be garroted and burnt at the stake.

<sup>116</sup> The list of penitents and punishments was published *in extenso* by CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 43-45.

who could be further milked for confessions and denunciations; one could always execute him at a later date.” Three Inquisitors agreed and four dissented. The latter insisted on the death penalty on a number of grounds. Francisco had not demonstrated proper contrition during the preceding ceremony. The *in extremis* confession was but a maneuver to escape death; its insincerity was patent because several denunciators had not been reciprocally denounced. Such a last-minute reprieve was a bad precedent and would encourage other *negativos* to delay their confessions to the last minute seeing they could still thereby escape execution. Nevertheless, Arganda’s minority opinion prevailed.<sup>117</sup>

Beatriz de Mora likewise was granted an *in extremis* confession at the *Auto*. She admitted standard Judaic practices, without going into detail and denounced only her sister Juana, appearing at the same *Auto* for reconciliation. The Inquisitors decided unanimously that her confession and denunciation were unsatisfactory and a feint inspired by fear of death. Her sentence to execution remained in force.<sup>118</sup>

After the close of the ceremony, when Francisco de Mora the Elder and his niece Beatriz were taken to the scaffold, just as they were being tied to their stakes for garroting, they were set upon by the spectators who stoned and clubbed them to death. Their skulls were split and their brains literally knocked out. Brain particles bespattered the crowd. A peasant whose collar was hit tore it off his jacket because, as he told bystanders, he would not “carry upon himself the stain of a Jew’s brain.” Another spectator, whose coat had blood marks, took it off and set fire to it.<sup>119</sup>

<sup>117</sup> See AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 219-221. CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 41-43, reproduces Francisco’s confession and its consequences *in extenso* from Francisco’s first trial (ADC leg. 315, no. 4562). He denounced his cousin Alonso del Campo, Catalina Navarra (deceased), his cousins Alonso, Antonio, Francisco, Lope, Isabel, Catalina and María, children of Juan de Mora. The other child, Luisa, had been incarcerated together with his own siblings. He further denounced Juan López de Armenia and his wife [his cousin Juana de Mora, not to be confused with Beatriz de Mora’s maiden sister Juana de Mora]. Further, with some hesitation (*aunque no lo sabe de cierto*), his cousin Rodrigo del Campo “because they are so prudent as a result of the reconciliation of his sister” [Elvira del Campo in 1568]. Further his father who taught him Judaism since he was 14 and his wife Leonor Enríquez, “whom his father taught to clean and sweep the house.” Révah indicates them all and Amiel lists them as victims (in two cases as probable victims) of subsequent *Autos de Fe*. Francisco confessed a number of standard Judaic acts and three specific Jewish “prayers” including the “Sema.”

<sup>118</sup> See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 133. Cf. Beatriz’s *proceso* (ADC leg. 318, no. 4586).

<sup>119</sup> See two versions of the original eyewitness report of the episode in CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 45, 93; French translation in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 134; paraphrase in AMIEL, “Marranisme I,” 221. Francisco de Mora the Elder’s *proceso* is incomplete and Beatriz de Mora’s contains no reference to the episode.

## 7. ASSESSMENTS AND AFTERMATH

At his last-minute *Auto* confession on August 12, 1590 Francisco de Mora Molina had denounced his wife, Leonor Enríquez, for “sweeping and cleaning the house on festivals and sometimes on Saturdays.” On September 9 she was arrested, arriving at the Cuenca inquisitorial prison on September 12. She and her husband had hidden 2.100 reals before his arrest, to avoid confiscation. She handed over 1.000 to the Inquisition upon her husband’s arrest (for his upkeep in prison) and to maintain herself and her children kept back 1.100, which she first hid in Alvaro Martinez de Mora’s stable and then in the courtyard of her own house.<sup>120</sup> When she was arrested she left her two boys with Dr. del Vallo, a widowed attorney formerly mayor of Quintanar, in whom she had confided where the money was hidden. Dr. del Vallo, later arrested for embezzlement, left the Cuenca municipal jail upon payment of 300 reals, the rest to be collected from the sale of his vineyards.<sup>121</sup>

Leonor confessed a standard core of three “Judaic prayers taught her by her father-in-law” and three improvised ones “taught her by Catalina Navarra, first cousin of her husband.”<sup>122</sup> An aunt of her husband’s who had purportedly indoctrinated her was Mari López (de Mora), deceased.<sup>123</sup> She tried to communicate with her husband by means of a rag bearing letters in black thread, sewn to the sleeve of a gown, which she left in a spot where her husband could see it as he passed by. The scheme discovered, she had to answer for it to the Inquisitors, tearfully explaining that she longed for news of her husband whom she had not seen for so long. At the Cuenca *Auto de Fe* of August 16, 1592 where her husband, Francisco de Mora Molina, finally suffered execution, she was reconciled and condemned to *sambenito* and penitential confinement.<sup>124</sup>

As Arganda had cynically foreseen when advocating the reprieve for “this eccentric,” Francisco did not let him down.

<sup>120</sup> See at the outset of Juan del Campo II’s *proceso* (ADC leg. 325, no. 4663) the letter of May 14, 1591, addressed from Quintanar by the “receiver” Pedro de Urgenio to the Cuenca Inquisitor, describing the search for the caches of Alonso del Campo’s and Francisco de Mora Molina’s money. Cf. AMIEL “Marranisme” I, 240.

<sup>121</sup> CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 33, 34, 37 based on her *proceso* ADC leg. 327, no. 4691; cf. AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 238-239. Amiel calls these financial details “unexpected and even amusing.”

<sup>122</sup> Catalina was already deceased. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 107.

<sup>123</sup> Leonor denounced a total of 30 persons, either deceased or already incarcerated. See her interesting *proceso* (ADC leg. 327, no. 4691).

<sup>124</sup> CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y Genealogía*.

At the close of the Cuenca *Auto* of August 12, 1590 Francisco was taken back to the prison along with his relatives Juan and Alonso del Campo the Younger and Juan López de Armenia the Younger, arrested upon earlier denunciations. The four were made to share a cell, which accounted for endless reciprocal denunciations to the Inquisitors of “Judaic acts.” During his manifold interrogations he denounced (once again) his late father; Isabel de Mora, deceased, wife of Diego del Campo, deceased; Catalina Navarra, deceased, wife of Pedro del Campo; Hernando de Mora, deceased; Inés de Mora, deceased and her son Francisco Navarro; Alonso del Campo the Elder and Isabel Romero, his wife; Diego del Campo; Juan del Campo I <sup>125</sup>; Pedro del Campo; Leonor del Campo; Ana del Campo; Juan de Mora the Elder, deceased; Isabel de Mora; Alonso de Mora; his “executed” uncle Francisco de Mora the Elder; Lope de Mora; Catalina de Mora; María de Mora; Cristóbal de Mora and his sons [?]; Álvaro de Mora, deceased <sup>126</sup>; Francisco de Mora Carrillo, deceased <sup>127</sup>; Diego de Mora, deceased, son of Lope de Mora; Lope de Mora, deceased; Juan López de Armenia the Elder and his wife Juana de Mora; Juan López de Mora the Younger; his own wife Leonor Enríquez; Catalina de Villanueva, wife of his uncle Francisco de Mora the Elder; Alonso de Mora; Ana de Mora, daughter of Francisco de Mora the Elder; Luisa de Mora; Isabel de Mora, Lope de Mora’s daughter; Lope de Mora, “the married one”; Rodrigo del Campo; Elvira del Campo <sup>128</sup>; Inés del Campo; Leonor Ruiz, Lope de Mora’s wife; Francisca Rodríguez, Damian López’s widow <sup>129</sup>; Ana de Mora, illegitimate daughter of Juan de Mora. <sup>130</sup>

<sup>125</sup> Amiel thus designates him to distinguish him from his nephew Juan del Campo II.

<sup>126</sup> He was a brother of the murdered Beatriz de Mora, who died before 1580. See RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 130. His *proceso* (ADC leg. 281, no. 3907), containing an elaborately calligraphed *Carta de edicto, citación y llamamiento* (Comminatory Letter) signed by Inquisitors Arganda and Velarde de la Concha on February 6, 1591, leads up to the burning of his disinterred remains at the August 16, 1592 *Auto*. The *Carta de edicto* is of course found in every *proceso* of a deceased or fugitive defendant

<sup>127</sup> I have neglected to consult his posthumous *proceso*: ADC leg. 329, no. 4703b.

<sup>128</sup> Francisco further on in the trial retracted this denunciation in view of her 1568 reconciliation. To no avail: She will perish as a relapse at the Cuenca *Auto* of August 16, 1592 at which 9 siblings, nieces and nephews were reconciled. Cf. AMIEL, “Marranisme” I, 225, 227; RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 107-108, 35-36. Amiel states 11, but of the 12 reconciled Campo’s on his list (*ibid.* 276) two were sentenced at the Toledo *auto* of June 9, 1591 and one at a Cuenca *Auto* (?) of October 4, 1593, which Amiel fails to describe among the others 1591-1600 on pp. 224-228.

<sup>129</sup> Aged 48 in 1589, her *proceso* (ADC leg. 323, no. 4640) reveals her various employments in New and Old Christian households, including 7 or 8 years from age 19 in that of Diego de Mora.

<sup>130</sup> She died in prison on May 30, 1592 and was “reconciled in effigy” on August 16, 1592 (erroneous information in RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 110). Her *proceso* is missing.

We have here 42 denounced relatives and a family retainer, including the 3 cellmates, plus the unnamed and unnumbered [in fact, non-existent] sons of Cristóbal de Mora, a grand total of over 50.<sup>131</sup> Almost all, including the deceased, were to wind up at *Autos* 1591-1600, two to be executed, the others reconciled and penanced. Can any modern historian in deadly earnest believe that Francisco de Mora Molina witnessed Judaizing on the part of these individuals, whose names he rattles off in a desperate effort to save his skin?

While Francisco was denouncing right and left and confessing Judaic prayers and ceremonies hand over fist, the inquisitorial spider web spread to the Mora relatives of Alcázar de Consuegra [*i.e.* de San Juan] and the neighboring town Argamasilla de Alba, which came under the tribunal of Toledo. The gambit of voluntarily presenting themselves in order to preempt arrest, which had been considered and rejected in Quintanar, was attempted a week after the Cuenca *Auto* of August 12, 1590. On August 21 Juan del Campo I of Argamasilla de Alba (brother of Elvira, Alonso, Rodrigo and Inés) betook himself to the Toledo tribunal and confessed to having observed the Law of Moses for some twenty years, up to his marriage with a pious Christian in 1580 or 1581. He denounced 35 relatives of Alcázar and Argamasilla. On August 22, 11 members of the López de Armenia family went through the same procedure. Incarceration ensued for all. In prison they produced more denunciations, leading to 13 new arrests and proceedings against two deceased persons. On September 1, 1590, the Toledan Inquisitor Andrés de Alava arrived in Alcázar where he conducted a visitation lasting through February 1591. A full-fledged *Auto* in the open air (*auto general de la fe*), in the presence of King Philip II and the infantes Philip and Isabel took place at Toledo on June 9, 1591. Of the 57 victims sentenced in person or in effigy, 27 were Judaizers (18 women), residents of Alcázar and vicinity, near or distant relatives of the Moras of Quintanar. María de la Vega was condemned to the stake; her mother (?) and a cousin (?), both deceased, executed in effigy.<sup>132</sup> The other 24, who had voluntarily confessed and denounced each other, were all reconciled, including Catalina Gómez, who had died in prison.<sup>133</sup>

<sup>131</sup> See CORDENTE MARTÍNEZ, *Origen y genealogía*, 36 based on Francisco's second *proceso* (ADC leg. 328, no. 4704).

<sup>132</sup> One María de la Vega was executed and another (aged 31) reconciled. I suspect Amiel or his source confused the two.

<sup>133</sup> See AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 221-224, whose statistics derive from administrative lists (*relaciones de presos y causas*). He cites directly but one of the seven extant *procesos* belonging to Mora family members sentenced at the Toledo *Auto* of June 9, 1591, kept in Madrid's AHN, which he lists. Renée Levine-Melammed studied in some detail the *procesos* of two of the voluntary confessors: Francisco de la Vega I (including his wife, Ana del Campo), AHN



To ensure the arrest of as many as possible of the 42 Mora relatives newly denounced by Francisco de Mora Molina, the *Suprema* appointed Cuenca Inquisitor Velarde de la Concha to conduct a visitation of Quintanar. It lasted from September 10 to October 17, 1590. In successive audiences no less than 93 inhabitants of Quintanar came before the Inquisitor to denounce Mora and Villanueva family members, 26 of them also to denounce Moriscos or a combination of Moras and Moriscos. Thus, on September 12, Mari Gutierrez denounced Pedro, Elvira and Inés del Campo for Judaic practices and, in addition, María de Mora and her Old Christian husband Pedro de Sauca for godparenting at a Morisco wedding – described in colorful detail – some ten years earlier. In his report to the *Suprema* dated October 18, Velarde de la Concha grumbles that the Moras' exemplary Christian life style hardly allows for satisfactory denunciations, albeit the newly accumulated testimony had led to three more arrests.<sup>134</sup>

#### 8. TWO LETTERS FROM FRANCISCO DE MORA MOLINA TO INQUISITOR ARGANDA

At this point we are going to make the first of two detours. October 2nd 1590: Francisco de Mora Molina had been in the cells for 25 months. Three months had gone by since his torture and a month and a half since his aborted execution. His wife, whom he had not seen since his fateful arrest, had been in

---

Inq., leg. 187, no. 8 (1590-1591) and Juan del Campo I, AHN Inq., leg. 138, no. 8 (1590-1594). Francisco denounced 25 relatives and Juan, 35. There is, of course, overlapping and many or all of those named had already been or were on trial or had testified and confessed or were deceased. Numerous excerpts from relatives' no longer extant *procesos* wherein depositions are made and the defendants in turn denounced precede each of these two *procesos*. Many of these depositions, especially in AHN Inq., leg. 187, no. 8 (Francisco de la Vega I), contain texts of "Judaizing prayers." See her "Judaizers and Prayer in Sixteenth-Century Alcázar," *In Iberia and Beyond. Hispanic Jews between Cultures*. Proceedings of a Symposium to mark the 500th anniversary of the Expulsion of Spanish Jewry. B.D. Cooperman, ed. (Newark, De. 1998), 273-295. Whereas Melammed assumes, like her predecessors, the authenticity of the "Marranism" recorded in the *procesos*, she is not so uncritical as to overlook discrepancies and contradictions, which should make any modern historian flinch. She also recognizes the necessity for defendants to confess and denounce abundantly if they want to survive.

<sup>134</sup> See ADC Libro 326 (*testificaciones*), ff. 166-248: 179. I thank W. Childers for his reference to this document and his description of its contents, part of his ongoing analysis of Morisco-New Christian relations in Quintanar. Cf. RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 135-136. See at the outset of ADC leg. 551, no. 6918, *proceso* of Leonor Ruiz, wife of Lope de Mora, two denunciations on the first day of the Quintanar visitation, September 10, 1590.



prison since September 9, 1590. He was not to see her again until the *Auto* of August 16, 1592. On October 2, 1590, Inquisitor Doctor Francisco de Arganda was making the rounds of the secret cells.<sup>135</sup> When he reached Francisco de Mora Molina's cell, the latter handed him a quire, on eight of whose pages he had written him two letters, which the Inquisitor accepted and ordered appended to Francisco's first *proceso* (ADC leg. 315, no. 4562).<sup>136</sup> That is where I came upon them during my perusal of the *proceso*. Astonishingly, no previous historian seems to have studied or even mentioned them. What follows is my diplomatic, annotated transcription of the two letters, in the order they appear in the *proceso*:<sup>137</sup>

### *First Letter*

*Yllustre Señor*

[Francisco de Mora Molina refers to the time before his own arrest, when his siblings, etc., had been arrested. This takes place in May 1588.]

*Jirónimo de Çapata de Savca*<sup>138</sup> me dixo a my que le diese paño [vellori] para vn vestido, y quel daría horden que todo quanto avía dicho contra mys hermanos en este Santo Ofiçio él lo desharía y no se ratificaría en ello porque en su mano estava librallos. Y así se lo dix a sus hermanos. Y esto lo sabe Alonso del Campo, trapero,<sup>139</sup> porque él me dio seis varas de paño<sup>140</sup> y no se lo pagué; no sé si le hice cédula dello o no. Y así lo tomaron el dicho paño Pedro de Sauca y el dicho Zapata y lo llevaron a tundir y luego lo llevar[on] a casa de Minchor Gómez, sastre, y le hicieron un vestido respuntado dello, ropilla y zaraguelles y ferreruero, para enbiar al dicho Zapata a su

<sup>135</sup> A curious reference to these rounds and his dialogues with the prisoners may be found in a confiscated letter smuggled out of his cell by Francisco's brother Juan de Mora (ADC leg. 318, no. 4587, audience of May 23, 1589).

<sup>136</sup> "En 2 días de el mes de Otubre de 1590, visitando los presos en sus cárceles secretas, Francisco de Mora Molina dio y entregó al Señor Inquisidor Doctor Arganda este pliego de papel escrito. El Señor Inquisidor lo tomó y mandó se ponga en su proceso del dicho Francisco de Mora Molina. Pasó ante mí [signed] Julián de Tudela." (Notary's description of appended autograph letters by Francisco de Mora Molina).

<sup>137</sup> I am much beholden to Dr. Juan Carlos Sofía Llorente and to Dr. Carsten Wilke for their help with the transcriptions and to the latter one for his critical reading and analysis of the contents.

<sup>138</sup> [Marginal note:] *Gerónimo Çapata*.

<sup>139</sup> [Marginal note:] *trapero*. [cuentas].

<sup>140</sup> [Marginal note:] *pañó, VI varas*.

*tierra. Y antes desto fingeron el dicho Zapata que iba con una comisión aunque bien saben que venía acá a rretificarse a Cuenca a este Santo Oficio. Y así lo dijo el dicho Zapata que lo había dicho acá al señor ynquisidor Rreñoso porque le pagasen en este Santo Oficio los días que se acupase. Y así fue fama que se los pagaron aunque yo le di dineros <sup>141</sup> para el camyno y su hermano le dio su cavallo para que vinyese a esta ciudad, y así vinero juntos en conpañya él y Damyán Gallardo, famylar. Y luego que fueron de aquí dixo el Zapata que no se avía rretificado que antes lo avía desecho todo y que no era nada, que no tenien que tener pena nynguna. Que ya estaba determinado, que aunque le dieran mil tormetos de no conocer nada si no decir que lo que avía dicho lo avía dicho con enojo y que tal no avía en ellos. Y qué le haría a Juan de Buenaventura que hiciera lo mysmo, siendo todo engaño y bellaquería, todo para sacarnos dineros.*

[María de Villanueva's goods confiscated, October 1589.]

*Y ansi andava el dicho Çapata quando hacían el secresto de my madre, hurtando todo lo que podía, en lo qual tomó no sé que tanto aceyte, <sup>142</sup> y le dixo Jirónimo Agustino, aguacil deste Sancto Ofiçio, que se fue de allí, que para qué andava entrando y saliendo, que por qué no los dexava y qué le aría a su hermano Francisco de Sauca que no dixese en llegando que llegase a Madrid. Y aunque le rrecivían juramento el comysario Collado de Villanueva que no dixera nada luego, nos decía todo quanto pasa y no pasava. <sup>143</sup> Y quando fue de aquí nos dixo que le avía dicho el señor ynquisidor Rrenoso tene cuenta con ellos, y lo que hacen callando sin que lo sienta la tierra y era todo sacándonos mill [acalinas]. Y esto save Alonso del Campo porque tanbién le sacavan a él y a su hijo, si lo queren decir.*

[Flashback to when Francisco de Mora Molina was still at large.]

*Hernando de Savca le dixo de cierta cevada <sup>144</sup> que vendí de my madre cien rreales, que dixo que yba a buscar a su hernano Francisco. Y así lo truxo de su tiera hasta Madrid según él dixo. Y luego fue Pedro de Savca ha Madrid ha hablalle y le di vna borrica, <sup>145</sup> que me costó seys mill maravedís. Y en binyendo dixo que se avía muerto en el camyno sin traer testimonio dello ni ningún recavdo.*

<sup>141</sup> [Marginal note:] *dióle dineros.*

<sup>142</sup> [Marginal note:] *aceyte*

<sup>143</sup> [Marginal note:] *reuelaua el secreto.*

<sup>144</sup> [Marginal note:] *Hernando de Sauca, cebada.*

<sup>145</sup> [Marginal note:] *borrica.*

[The Saucas' visit and accompanying swindles take place between Francisco de Mora Molina's arestation (May 27, 1588) and his wife's (September 9, 1590).]

*Y en yendo que fueron desta ciudad, entramos que avían estado presos, el vno en este Santo Ofiçio y el otro en la cárcel de la ciudad, y se fueron a my casa, y por fuerça le hicieron a my muguer que los tubiese hallí. Y los tuvo dos o tres mes a su costa,<sup>146</sup> dándoles de comer de lo que la pobre ylava y de lo que vuesa señoría le dava de limosna, y no se contentaron con esto, sino quando se quisieron yr le hicieron que le aquilase vn jumento<sup>147</sup> y nunca más lo bolvieron, si que dicen que lo vendieron, y así la prove lo vbo de pagar, que le costó más de diez ducados. Y también le sacaron Alonso del Campo no sé quantos rreales<sup>148</sup> qué l lo dirá y a Juan López de Armenya lo mismo y a Rrodrigo del Campo y atras personas de nosotros, todo con falsas palabras, engallándolos, porque así lo tien de costumbre. Y vna rropa de terciopello<sup>149</sup> que quedó de my hermana María de Mora, que valí más de vente ducados, en my casa se la llevó también el dicho Pedro de Savca, y porque yo no se la quería dar me hacía fieros.*

[Flashback to when Francisco de Mora Molina's father was still alive (died c. 1581).]

*Por eso vuesa señoría lo cobre todo: Damyán Gallardo debe más seys fanegas de centeno<sup>150</sup> que yo di en vida de my padre, en verde, para sus mulas, de vna haca que linda con el palomar de Andrés Hernández de la Romera, ques agora de my madre. Si no pareciere la cédula<sup>151</sup> con los avtos de Damián Gallardo, lo save Andrés Pérez, vecino del Quientanar, y lo sabe Martín Ochos de Vergara, contador que fue de la mesa maestral, y lo sabe Miguel de Vsabaraça, questá en Almagro, y si no está en Almagro, Andrés Pérez dirá a dónde viben entramos. Para esta cédula tiene pagado cinco v seys fanegas de cevada que a my Francisco de Mora me dio en dos v tres veces pa para senbrar en vida de my padre, sábelo Myguel de Vsabaraça, porque se las dio my padre a cobrar en Ocaña para cuenta de lo que devía my padre al dicho contador. Y yendo el dicho Damyán Gallardo a Ocaña le quisieron char preso y vino muy enojado a my padre: que por qué lo avía hecho tan mal en dar las obligaciones a cobra, y así le hiço vna cédula de lo que montavan las quatro obligaciones<sup>152</sup> y le dio my padre vna carta*

<sup>146</sup> [Marginal note:] *los tuuo a su costa.*

<sup>147</sup> [Marginal note:] *jumento.*

<sup>148</sup> [Marginal note:] *reales.*

<sup>149</sup> [Marginal note:] *ropa de terciopelo.*

<sup>150</sup> [Marginal note:] *Damián Gallardo, centeno.*

<sup>151</sup> [Marginal note:] *cédula.*

<sup>152</sup> [Marginal note:] *cédula.*

para <sup>153</sup> el dicho Miguel de Vsabaraça que le diese las dichas obligaciones que ya le dexava echa cédula dellas. Y así se las dio y le desenbargó cierto dinero que le tinía enbargado en poder de Gaspar de Villacanes Civero, contador que fue del partido de Ocaña y rribera de Tajo, difunto ques ya. Y así podrá buesa señoría averiguar muy bien la verdad. Y si dixere que lo tiene pagado no tiene tal ni en su vida dio blanca dellos, porque si lo vbiera pagado lo supira yo muy bien porque la dicha cédula estava en casa de my madre con los demás atos, que eran más de veynte ojas, todo cosido, en el alacena, donde dicen el palacio a la puerta el Sol, y tasado en el proceso las costas que se avían echo, queran buen rrato, porquél nunca pagó preñçipal ni costas. Y estas la verdad porque salieron las más costas que se hicieron de my bolsa, myre vuesa señoría si lo sabré yo.

[May 1588, whe Francisco de Mora Molina tried to avoid arrest.]

Díxome el dicho Francisco Martín Cerrudo que quando viniere a esta ciudad que preguntase por su casa y que allí me darían lo que fuese menester de muy buena gana. Quando salieron del espital de Santiago Pedro de Savca y my tío dixeron que abía echo mucho con ellos el dotor Grima y les avía [amosado] la casa y la botica, y les dixo y puso su mano en el pecho y dixo que, por el ávito que traía, quél haría lo que pudiese, que para eso que no tinyen que venyr acá, quél se lo tinía en cargo como tinía la obligación a su padre de los presos y que la carta que traían de su hermano que no la quería rrecevir, que la abriéramos nosotros porque no le dixeran que avía rreçevido carta nynguna porquél pudiera más libremente hacer alguna cosa por ellos avnquél pudi tan poco hacer por ellos porque si fuera solo, mas queran tantos. Y con esto les dixo que se fuesen con la vendición de Dios a su posada que si no vinyeran al negoçio que vinían, quél les diera de buena gana a çenar y posada y que no dixesen a nadie que avían venyno a su posada. Y con esto se despidieron del dicho dotor Grima. Y nos lo contaron a Diego Patino y a my antes que llegásemos a la posada donde posamos, y así lo dirá Patino si se acuerda; lo del paño de Çapata dirá Alonso del Canpo y su hyjo y my muger; lo de la jumenta que yo le di dirá Antonio Martínez y my muger y Alonso Martínez y en la rropa ni más ni menos los dichos; en lo de el borrico que le llevaron a my muger dirá Juan López de Armenya y su hijo y el dicho Anotio y Alonso Martínez y también dirán los dichos en las seys varas de paño del dicho Çapata, porquello publico y notorio, y el sastre dirá también que se dice Minchor Gómez, ques vivo y sano.

Alonso de Mora dirá vuesa señoría y dará rraçón de la carta que llevamos desta ciudad de Francisco Martínez Cerrudo para Damyán Gallardo, porquel dicho Alonso de Mora dixo al dicho Damyán Gallardo quando se la llevó a su casa la carta que tinía sospecha de la carta que traía alguna cosa contra nosotros. Y el dicho Damyán Gallardo le dixo liberalmente ábrala y léygala y verá lo que tra la carta. Y así la

<sup>153</sup> [Marginal note, horizontal:] *Que le tinían enbargado los quatro çientos ducados de la escrivanía questavan en poder de Gaspar de Villanes y asta que llevase las obligaciones no se las darían*

*abrió el dicho Alonso de Mora y la leyó, y dixo después el dicho Alonso de Mora que le pareció que le avía pesado al dicho Damyán Gallardo de decille que la abriese, lo qual el dicho Alonso de Mora tiene tan buena memoria que le dirá a vuesa señoría todo lo que vinía en la carta. Sólo me acuerdo yo de dos cosas de oýrselo decir al dicho Alonso de Mora: la vna, quel señor ynquisidor Rrenoso avía dicho que lo avía echo muy bien en la prisión de mys hermanos y, lo otro, qué yría dentro de quinze días v antes a haçer la ynformación de su hijo de la famyliatura, porque al presente andava haciendo çiertas averiguaçiones deste Santo Ofiçio. Y también lo sabe esto Pedro de Savca porque se lo contó el dicho Alonso de Mora cómo avía leýdo la dicha carta, y sé yo questá harto mal con el Damyán Gallardo, y así lo dirá el dicho Savca.*

[Request for help from the Inquisitor to alleviate his present distress.]

*Suplico a vuesa señoría sea serbido de mandalle al despensero que me trayga vnos capatos, que ya tengo ahorrado dos rreales y medio y yo ahorraré luego lo demás y ya le pagado doçientos más que le devía, porque ando descalço y me me muero de frío. Vuesa señoría me dio agora dos años vara y media de cordellate para vn fagero por amor de la yjada y se me acabado. Suplico a buesa señoría sea serbido de darme otro tanto, porque lo e mucho menester, que por pagalle lo que yo le devía al despensero no lo e conprado yo, avnque lo laste de mys carnes y de algunos vestidos avnque sean de gerga, porque çierto yo padezco grandísimo frío y no anpeçado antrar el ynvierno. Y esto haga vuesa señoría por amor de Dios de limosna porque yo padezço mucho travajo que ya con estar el hombre vestido cufrirá el travaxo. Y si no tráyanse del Quintanar, pues questán echos que allá no ganar nada y quiça trae algunos dellos vestidos el depositario, porquie lo que tengo vestido, como a tantos días que lo traygo y no tiene pelo, no me abriga nnyguna cosa.*

[Return to May 1588 when Francisco de Mora Molina tried to avoid arrest.]

*También les dixo el dotor Grima que fuesen al dotor Nogerón quera muy buen letrado para que nos ayudase. Y benymos Pedro de Savca y yo y le hablamos junto a San Pedro, en la calle, y nos dixo qué no sabía si estavan presas las personas que diciamos, que bueno fuera de acer questavan presas oy después salir ellas libres y de borrallas él que no lo haría, mas ques estos señores le mandavan que lo hiciese, qué lo hari de muy buena gana, y si no que de otra manera no lo haría. Y esto rrespondió el dicho dotor Nogerón. Y así lo dirá Pedro de Savca si lo queiere decir oy.*

*Con esto no separamos dél y pensávamos presentalle un cuero de vino blanco, y como le vimos que tan desgraciadamente nos rrespondió no le dimos nada. Y así lo bendimos dos cueros el vno de blanco y el otro de tinto a vn hombre que vibe en la carretería que tiene cuenta con rrequerir la casa de la moneda que dicen que tiene cada día quatro ducados de rrenta en ella, y entiendo que se llama Anriquez avnque no me acuerdo bien dello.*



Al señor

Quommo de capata des adca me de po amy que le desepano dellor  
 que se capata que el darte hor den que todo quanto adue  
 dicho con los hermanos En este año oficio de los des harie  
 nose de hficarie en ello por que en sumario esta de libra  
 los ansí se lo dio a sus hermanos que esto lo sabe a del  
 campo de pero por que el medio se b barias de panos nose  
 lo pague nose si le hiee cordula del lo vno ansí lo firmaron  
 el dho panos de rodesa deca y el dho capata lo llevar  
 a tinor y luego lo llevaron a casa de mndy gomez sab  
 tre y le hicieron un bicho de es puntado de lo de pillay a  
 raquelles y se fue para En bhar el dho capata de m  
 hera y antes de esto fingeron el dho capata que y va con  
 una comysion donque diera bien que viniera a de  
 nificar se a cuena de este año oficio ansí lo dho de  
 el dho capata que lo adue dho deca el señor y n que  
 si dho de no porque le pagasen en este año oficio los  
 dias que se a cu pade ansí fue fama que se los paga  
 ron donque y le di dinero para el camino y  
 su hermano le dio esuca de lo para que viniera  
 Estacero ansí vino a Quintis en con panos e l  
 samy angallar de famy harz luego que fueron  
 de aqui dho de capata que nose adue de hficario  
 que an tes lo adue de echo p do y quando era de lo  
 no hmen que tener genam nquid que ya es de de se  
 terminado que don que le dieran mel hmetas de  
 no cono con nada sino dhoer que lo que adue dho lo d  
 de dho con eno p que tal no adue en el of y  
 que le harie Juan de buena de ntra que he  
 diera lo mismo dho todo engano y della que era  
 todo para sacar nos dinero y ansí andaba el dho  
 capata quando ha cien el se creb de m madre hub  
 tando todo lo que pudiese En lo que el pmo nose quedan

Fig. 1. First page of autograph First Letter to Inquisitor Francisco de Arganda by Francisco Mora Molina, ADC leg. 315, no. 4562 (Courtesy Archivo Diocesano de Cuenca).



*Second letter**Yllustre señor*

*Yo padezco mucho trabaxo en esta cárcel con mucho frio de noche y de día que no lo pudo sinificar. Lo vno, yo no tengo más de la lana del colchón con vn antraxo echo pedaços y muy sucio que no se a lavado después questoy aquí y está con muchos prioxos y pulgas y chinches y como están metidas en la lana no se pueden tomar y la manta tiene vn dedo de mugre, que todo está ya cansado destar en esta cárcel, ¡qué haré yo!. Lo otro, yo no tengo vestidos que me callienten, que ya se pueden dar por bien servidos, y descalço, que no tengo çapatos. Yo padezco mucho qual me rremedie Dios con su misericordia. Suplico a buesa señoría sea servido de darme a my muguer, pues ella tiene buen colchón y ropa que yo me pasare con veynte [más] de rraçón, y con esto no será menester proveerme de ropa de cama, que yo le haré que diga de todas las personas que supiere, pues vuesa señoría sabe quan determinado esto yo de que se le diga la verdad desto llanamente, y hágalo por amor de Dios pues así lo hiço con mys hermanos no sea yo menos aquellos pues a tanto que no la e visto. Y si se supiere de alguna haçien questé encubierta también se le dirá la verdad en todo lo que los Savcas han hecho también se le dirá a vuesa señoría la verdad, porque yo deseo que descargemos nuestras conciencias muy bien descargadas y, lo otro, por contentar a vuesa señoría, que no tengo otro padre después de Dios porque me a de dar la vida con el favor de Dios. ¡O quien pudiera besar la tierra por donde vuesa señoría anda que yo lo hiçiera de muy buena gana! Y en esto no tome vuesa señoría pesadumbre por ello. Rrogéles a mys primos que hiciésemos cama junta, y de aquellos bieron la grande porquería que yo tenía y los andraxos no quisieron, pues en verdad que no por falta de alinpiarme yo todo lo que puedo, sino que ya está harto de serbir.*

To make some sense of these letters' cryptic allusions, we should note that there were four Sauca brothers. Hernando and Pedro, brothers-in-law of Francisco de Mora Molina (Francisca de Mora married Hernando and María de Mora married Pedro) are the only ones mentioned in the published researches of Révah-Wilke and Amiel. We now learn of two additional brothers, Francisco and Jerónimo, the nemeses of Francisco de Mora Molina. Indeed, he holds Jerónimo responsible for his siblings' arrest.<sup>154</sup> Incidentally, the Sauca brothers' full surname was Sauca de Vera Zapata.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>154</sup> As we have seen above, Révah & Wilke and Amiel, apparently unaware of Jerónimo's identity, failed to mention his denunciations. They are the fifth preliminary denunciation, dated January 29, 1580, in the *proceso* of Francisco's sister Francisca de Mora, wife of Hernando de Sauca (ADC leg. 314, no. 4555) and the first in the *proceso* of Francisco's cousin Luisa de Mora (ADC leg. 314, no. 4553), where I have perused them.

<sup>155</sup> See ADC leg. 315, no. 4560, combined *proceso* of Hernando and Pedro de Sauca. Cf. AMIEL, "Marranisme" I, 232. We see that Francisco de Mora Molina refers to Jerónimo simply

According to Francisco de Mora Molina, the Saucas' duplicity towards their in-laws began before Diego de Mora's death. Did Francisco and Jerónimo, whose attitude appears more brazen, pull Hernando and Pedro into extortionist practices? What is the relationship between the Saucas and Damián Gallardo, who apparently rendered services to Diego de Mora in his tax farming for the Order of Santiago? Between the arrest of Francisco de Mora Molina's siblings (April 25, 1588) and Francisco's own arrest (May 27, 1588), they travelled together to Cuenca and had their expenses paid from two sides. Did Hernando and Pedro Sauca betray the Moras after their wives' incarceration? Perhaps we should assume that these two Saucas simply married for the Mora money (María's and Francisca's dowries) in the first place.<sup>156</sup>

If I correctly interpret the thrust of his first letter to the Inquisitor, Francisco de Mora Molina is attempting to survive by informing the Inquisition about "missing" parts of his and his relatives' confiscated assets. Thus, during his "sessions at the Desk," he is playing the role of the Inquisition's prize helpmeet, not merely in the location and identification of the "hidden Judaic heresy" but also in the location and identification of "stolen Mora assets" of which the thieves deprived the Inquisition's coffers. In both cases, he would make the Inquisition's interests his own.

[Continuará]

---

as "Zapata" and to Pedro, Hernando and Francisco by their first names plus only "de Sauca." In their *proceso* Pedro (35 in 1588) signs "Pedro Sauca de Vera Zapata" and Jerónimo (23 in 1588) is referred to as "Jerónimo Zapata." The latter declares to the Inquisitors "*que es [...] hijodalgo y xpiano viejo de todas partes sin ninguna raza de moro ni de judío ni de otra secta danada.*"

<sup>156</sup> Did Hernando de Sauca, later "*alguazil de Corte*" in Madrid, lose interest in his New Christian wife? He had an Old Christian mistress (see RÉVAH & WILKE, *Un écrivain*, 207).